AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2012 No. 51

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 28, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER 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 17, 2012, 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.

THE TIME TO REBUILD AMERICA IS NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation winds down from its military engagements overseas, it's time for America to do some nation-building here at home.

A $1.2 trillion investment in rebuilding American roads, bridges, transit, and water systems would create 27 million jobs over 5 years. In the first year alone, the economy would add 5.2 million new jobs and grow by over $400 billion. In the second year, unemployment would be reduced to 5.6 percent. These are among the findings of the New America Foundation report, ''The Way Forward.''

Nearly every expert agrees that America's infrastructure is broken and is in need of immediate repair and replacement. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave America a D grade for infrastructure quality. It is estimated that $2.2 trillion is needed to bring our Nation's infrastructure to good repair. The World Economic Forum ranks the United States 23rd in infrastructure quality. Transportation for America reports that there are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges nationwide, including 2,000 in New York and 99 in western New York alone.

In fact, every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient. Dangerous road conditions were a significant factor in one-third of all traffic fatalities last year, and Americans spent 4.2 billion hours stuck in traffic due to congestion, costing $78 billion, or $710 for every American motorist.

The 1987 collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York killing 10 people and the 2007 collapse of the Minneapolis bridge killing 13 people are tragic reminders of the human costs associated with deteriorating infrastructure.

The economic costs are staggering, too. The United States Chamber of Commerce says that the Nation will lose $336 billion in economic growth in the next 5 years due to inadequate infrastructure. One local example: in January, the New York State Department of Transportation closed a crucial bridge in Springville, New York, due to concerns about its safety, and the weeks-long closure was devastating to local businesses.

The time to rebuild America is now. Actually, it's right now. The cost of borrowing money is at a historic low rate. The interest rates on 5-year debt is less than 1 percent. The Treasury Department is considering negative interest rates, meaning that investors will actually pay the Federal Government to buy United States debt.

The question is not whether to undertake this work. Public infrastructure is a public responsibility. The question is when to undertake this work. The cost acceleration of delaying road and bridge repair increases by 500 percent after only 2 years. Put simply, a $1 million road repair project today not undertaken will cost $5 million in 2014; a $5 million bridge repair project will cost $25 million in 2014. What's more, a 5-year $1.2 trillion program would create such robust economic activity that it would generate an additional $600 billion in Federal tax revenues, that is to say that our country would be purchasing $1.2 trillion in investment for infrastructure for nearly half off.

The United States has spent $76 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, a population of 30 million people, and $63 billion rebuilding Iraq, a population of 27 million people. Both of these nation-building efforts were deficit financed. And as they took money out of the American economy, they actually undermined American economic growth and employment.

And for America, a population of over 300 million, the House is considering a 5-year $260 billion transportation bill, or $52 billion each year for the next 5 years, on average. That's less in any given year than we spent in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Rebuilding our Nation's roads and bridges will support private sector American businesses. Construction trade jobs average approximately $70,000 a year, and these jobs can't be outsourced to China or Mexico.

HELMETS TO HARDHATS

Mr. HIGGINS. I began this morning by talking about the wars in Iraq and

☐ 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.

Afghanistan. Let me now say something about our returning veterans.

The unemployment rate for returning veterans under the age of 24 is an unacceptably high rate of 38 percent. A good and grateful Nation owes it to these veterans to ensure that they return home to economic opportunity.

The Department of Defense sponsored a program back in 2002 called Helmets to Hardhats to accelerate apprenticeship training and job placement for these returning veterans. Helmets to Hardhats is now a nonprofit organization working with 15 construction trades and over 80,000 American businesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right time to make a robust investment to repair our outdated and failing infrastructure. There's a lot of work to be done, and a lot of Americans need to be put to work.

BULLYING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, I was watching the weekly Fox television program entitled ''Huckabee.'' Bullying was the featured issue.

Mr. Speaker, bullying has become a severely significant issue in some schools across our country.

Bullies, with limited exception, select their targets or victims in this manner: the victims are smaller in physical stature than are the bullies and are usually younger in years.

The victims of bullying become depressed and embarrassed, resulting in physical and emotional damage. One young lad became so distraught that he died by his own hand. Yes, he took his own life because of the damage that bullying had inflicted upon him.

The ''Huckabee'' program, in addition to having interviewed a bullying victim and his family, featured as well the director of the recently released movie entitled ''Bully.'' I urge you all to see this movie.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insist that bullies are punished at their schools by their parents and are prosecuted as juveniles if they are still minors.

We should cut no slack to bullies. They deserve no slack. If exposure could link the bullies to the aforementioned suicide, perhaps that should be pursued as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bullying plague must be resolved, but it will be resolved only when the bullies receive the punishment they deserve.

PUERTO RICO SNAP RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing the Puerto Rico SNAP Restoration Act.

In 1971, Congress enacted legislation to partially include Puerto Rico in what is today called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and what was then called the Food Stamp program.

□ 1010

Implementation of the Food Stamp program in Puerto Rico began in 1974. In 1977, Congress amended Federal law to fully include Puerto Rico in the Food Stamp program so that rules governing eligibility and benefits applied no differently on the island than they did in the 50 States. Four years later, however, Congress exercised its authority under the Territory Clause and removed Puerto Rico from the Food Stamp program, electing to provide the island government with an annual block grant instead. Since 1982, Puerto Rico has used this block grant to administer its Nutrition Assistance Program, which differs from SNAP in a number of material respects.

The bill I'm introducing today, which I will seek to include in the 2012 farm bill, would reinstate the SNAP program in Puerto Rico in place of the block grant.

If this bill is enacted into law, Puerto Rico would join the 50 States, the District of Columbia and two U.S. territories—Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands—as jurisdictions fully participating in SNAP. My decision to file legislation converting Puerto Rico back to SNAP was made after carefully weighing the benefits and costs associated with this conversion. I relied primarily upon an in-depth study prepared by the USDA which evaluated the feasibility and impact of reinstating SNAP in Puerto Rico. On this subject, as with other important issues that I'm tackling, I have adhered to the principle that it is essential to build a strong evidentiary record prior to taking legislative action.

The USDA report is comprehensive and raises a number of important policy questions, but its bottom-line message for Puerto Rico is crystal clear, namely, while there are some tradeoffs associated with the conversion to SNAP, the benefits of conversion far outweigh the costs.

Let me be more specific. Applying certain assumptions, the USDA study found that conversion would increase the number of households that receive nutrition assistance in Puerto Rico by over 15 percent. An additional 85,000 households would become eligible for assistance under SNAP. Moreover, restoring SNAP would raise the average monthly benefit by participating households by nearly 10 percent. And instituting equal treatment for Puerto Rico under SNAP would mean an additional $457 million in Federal spending for the island each year, over 90 percent of which would take the form of additional benefits.

These numbers reveal a fundamental truth: because Congress removed Puerto Rico from SNAP 20 years ago, hundreds of thousands of needy children, families, and seniors on the island have received no nutrition assistance at all or have received far fewer benefits than they would have received if they lived in the 50 States or even in the neighboring Virgin Islands.

Accordingly, Puerto Rico's exclusion from this program serves as yet another example of how the American citizens I represent, especially my most vulnerable constituents, are treated unequally because of the island's territory status.

Whether I'm fighting to convert Puerto Rico back to SNAP or to increase the island's annual block grant, I strongly believe this is a fight worth making. By ensuring that the neediest of my constituents can afford a healthy diet, we enable them to lead a dignified and independent life, which in the long run helps reduce health care costs and takes pressure off other safety net programs.

THE RYAN BUDGET AND THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for the future of our Republic. In this Capitol, we are debating and voting on budgets, laying out our visions for how we should handle the spending, taxing, and debt issues facing America in the coming years. Across the street at the Supreme Court, they're debating what, if any, limits can be placed on the Federal Government's power to regulate under the Commerce Clause of our Constitution.

But, really, we're talking about the same thing: Do we still live under a Federal Government of limited and enumerated powers? Do we believe that the source of our government begins in ''We the people''? Do we believe in liberty? Do we trust people to make their own decisions about their own lives without reliance on, or subservience to, an all-knowing and all-powerful central government in Washington? Are there limits on what Washington can demand of the citizens that it's supposed to be serving? Republicans believe that the answer to these questions is a resounding ''yes.''

The budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee shows that it is possible for this Congress to offer solutions to the challenges of the modern world that are rooted in limited government, individual freedom, and the Constitution. It is our responsibility to govern and to offer the people an alternative to the do-nothing attitude of the Senate Democrat leadership or the business-as-usual, tax-spend-and-borrow budget offered by the President.

The arguments being made by the plaintiffs against the individual mandate are that the Constitution is not dead, that at least one party in Washington and a majority of the country still believe that the Constitution means what it says, and that there are limits on the power of Congress and of the executive branch.

I'm energized and hopeful for the future of this great Republic as I see these events unfold this week, and I'm reminded of the observation of President Reagan:

I hope we once again have reminded people that man is not free unless government is limited. There's a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predictable as a law of physics: as government expands, liberty contracts.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the clock is ticking here in Congress and especially on the floor of the House where people around the country would like to be preparing for the next construction season. Indeed, the most important action for the economy, for job creation, and for strengthening the livability of our communities might well be enacting the Surface Transportation Act. Sadly, so far, the news has not been good.

Later today, we debate the House Republican budget, which would slash infrastructure funding to a level less than is required simply to meet obligations for contracts that we've already entered into with people that are building roads, bridges, and transit systems. And we have an obligation to them. They're down that path and the budget sadly would not even allow the Federal Government to meet its partnership obligation.

There's more bad news as we see the Republican leadership can't come to grips with what would be required to move the transportation authorization bill forward. Last month, they offered up what has been characterized as the worst transportation bill in history. It was partisan, and it was unbalanced. It would have overturned two decades of transportation reform, undercut transit and the vital enhancement programs that communities have used to improve the quality of life and stretch their transportation resources. It even attacked bike and pedestrian programs, eliminating Safe Routes to School for our children.

Well, luckily, it collapsed under its own weight. They were afraid to even have a hearing on it before it came to the floor, and then they found out that there wasn't an opportunity to pass it. The support wasn't there in the face of united opposition around the country from people who care about transportation. At the same time, the Senate has given us a balanced and bipartisan bill. Seventy-four Members of the other body voted for it and passed it over to us.

I would hope that there is time for us to stop playing partisan ideological games with this vital transportation bill. The headlines that the Republican maneuvering has done is an embarrassment to Speaker BOEHNER and to Chairman MICA. But not just to the Republican leadership; it's an embarrassment to the House.

□ 1020

I'm sorry that my Republican friends and colleagues can't seem to agree amongst themselves about a path forward. They cannot get 218 Republican votes for any bill, even the Speaker's proposal. The good news is they don't have to. There are 435 Members of the House. If they would work in a bipartisan basis, as we have done in the past, we can stop this short-term roulette; we can give the construction industry, local government, and people in the private and public sector the certainty they need for not just this construction cycle, but the next construction cycle. We can put tens of thousands of people to work, bolster the economy, and do what Congress needs to do, what Congress has done always until this point.

I hope the Republican leadership, before we leave this week, will at least allow the bipartisan Senate bill to come to the floor to be voted on. I'm confident that a majority will support it, and we'll meet our obligations to keep America moving and the economy growing.

ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, all-of-the-above energy. It's a plan first introduced by House Republicans when gas prices spiked during the summer of 2008. For the 2 years prior, congressional Democrats were following a green energy plan only, doing their best to completely eliminate the traditional forms of energy like petroleum, natural gas, and coal that account for 83 percent of our energy consumption.

When President Obama took office in 2009, he took up their flag and began pushing for his controversial cap-and-trade law that even he admitted would mean electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. He appointed an Energy Secretary that admitted on national TV that he wanted our gas prices at European levels. Well, they're both on their way. Since then, energy costs have doubled, gas prices have skyrocketed, and we are in a crisis in this country when it comes to our energy use.

Just as we saw in the summer of 2008, when these gasoline prices spiked and our energy costs rose, the price of everything else is soon to follow. When his cap-and-trade bill failed to get enough support in a Democratic-controlled Congress, he set out to have the EPA basically regulate the bill into law.

Over the last 3 years, the EPA has issued some of the most costly regulations on power plants in their history. By 2016, the Utility MACT regulation is expected to cost $9.6 billion annually in direct costs, and some analysts estimate its total indirect costs closer to $100 billion. The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule is expected to impact over 1,000 power plants across the country, and, by the EPA's own estimates, it's estimated to cost $2.8 billion annually.

With no business experience in this administration, I don't think they realize that when the cost of doing business goes up, business prices go up; and that affects every hardworking American taxpayer at the pump. When he turns on a light at home, when he buys a loaf of bread, when he goes to buy a U.S.-manufactured product, it costs.

According to the President's own Commerce Department, the Boiler MACT regulation in itself is expected to cost between 40,000 and 60,000 jobs. The impact of these regulations is already being felt. Last month, two utility companies announced the closing of 10 of their power plants as a direct result of some of the strict new regulations—another move that will raise the price of electricity for consumers.

Yet it seemed as though the President had finally come around when he said in his State of the Union speech earlier this year, right here in this room: This country needs an all-out all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every available resource of American energy.

It's not often that I agree with the President, but at that point I did.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't stayed true to his words. In fact, just yesterday the EPA announced their latest set of regulations that will effectively ban the building of any new coal-fired power plants by dramatically decreasing carbon dioxide emissions.

Whether the President and environmentalists like it or not, coal currently accounts for almost half of the electricity generated in this country. Effectively eliminating coal-fired power plants is only going to increase the cost of electricity to American families.

We can no longer allow the White House to say one thing and do another when it comes to energy. If the President truly supports the Republican all-of-the-above energy strategy as he claimed he did, then he needs to follow through.

It's time we start to take advantage of all of the God-given natural resources this country has and to have American-made energy, American-made power that will power this Nation.

U.S.-AFGHANISTAN POLICY IN SHAMBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Afghanistan is as bleak as I can remember at any point in the last 10½ years that we've been at war.

In recent months, we've seen the burning of the Koran by American troops, a video of soldiers urinating on bodies of dead Afghans, spontaneous riots in the Afghan streets protesting the continued U.S. occupation, as well as deadly attacks by Afghan soldiers on the U.S. and NATO forces that are there to help and to train them.

And now, in the most grotesque tragedy imaginable, 2 weeks ago a U.S. staff sergeant left his base, walked more than a mile to an Afghan village outside Kandahar, going door-to-door and systematically gunning down 17 civilians.

The New York Times reported that one Afghan farmer was visiting a nearby town for the day and returned home to find that his wife, four sons, and four daughters had all been murdered in the attack. And here's the irony: According to the Times' account, because the Taliban still lingered in the area, the farmer had been concerned about moving his family back to this part of southern Afghanistan last year, but he was reassured by the very fact that he would be near an American military base.

With these latest atrocities, how can we expect President Karzai, a reluctant ally under the best of circumstances, to continue to cooperate? How do we expect to convince the Taliban to come to the negotiating table for a peace and reconciliation settlement? And most importantly, after this incident, how do we convince the people of Afghanistan that we are their friends, that our presence in their country is a force for good?

Staff Sergeant Robert Bales will be tried for these unspeakable crimes, but I also think any responsibility analysis would conclude that he is also a victim of the war. He was on his fourth deployment. He clearly suffered from posttraumatic stress disorder, or even worse, mental health affliction. He clearly had no business being on active duty.

Mr. Speaker, more than a decade of war is weakening and wreaking havoc with the bodies and minds of our servicemembers. Staff Sergeant Bales will be held to account. But what about the cruel and unforgiving war machine that absolutely has to bear some responsibility? When are we going to finally set warfare aside and embrace a SMART Security approach?

Yesterday, 80 retired top military leaders took out an ad in Politico calling for robust investment in development, diplomacy, and other civilian efforts that will do a lot more than military force to keep America safe. And yet the Republican budget we'll debate later today cuts that very foreign aid in humanitarian programs.

□ 1030

When will we learn, Mr. Speaker? How bad does it have to get?

Our Afghanistan policy is an absolute shambles, and the American people know it. The latest polling shows more than two-thirds, 69 percent, believe we shouldn't be waging this war.

This is the moment we must realize that this mission has no hope of succeeding, that the only humane and responsible course is to end the war at once. This is the moment, finally, after all the tragedy and mayhem, to bring our troops home.

STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to highlight the epidemic of sexual assault and rape in the military.

Next week will mark the 1-year anniversary of my first floor speech on this issue. That day, I told the story of Technical Sergeant Mary Gallagher, who was raped by a coworker while deployed in Iraq. The week leading up to the rape, Sergeant Gallagher's assailant harassed her, stalked her, and attempted to break into her room.

Though she twice reported the assailant's threatening behavior, her command did nothing about it. They called it a ''he said-she said'' scenario. Justice was not served.

I've told the story of Army Specialist Blake Stephens, who was consistently assaulted and sexually harassed by the men in his unit. He reported the harassment to command, but no action was taken. Fellow servicemembers later sodomized him with a bottle; and the only punishment his assailants received was extra pushups. Justice was not served.

Last week, I told the story of Marine Lieutenant Elle Helmer, who reported repeated sexual harassment by superiors, to no avail. The Marine Corps did absolutely nothing in response to the harassment. Lieutenant Helmer was later raped by another superior whose behavior went unpunished.

Her command ultimately told her, You're tough. You need to pick yourself up and dust yourself off. I can't babysit you all of the time. No justice was served.

Mary, Blake and Elle, like so many victims I've heard from, paint a picture of a military culture that treats sexual harassment and assault with silent acceptance, a culture that punishes victims for reporting the crimes committed against them.

The military refutes this; yet evidence suggests just the reverse. The ''Hurt Feelings Report'' that stands beside me is a repugnant example of how rape and sexual assault has been trivialized, and how a victim was mocked in the military.

It was supposed to be satire. The ''report'' was posted on the Facebook page of a female captain in charge of the Marine Barracks Protocol Office just a few months ago. It mocks fellow marines who file sexual assault complaints with a list of ''Reasons for filing this report,'' which include options such as:

''I'm a little b———.''

''I'm a little p———.''

''I'm a cry baby.''

And ''I want my mommy.''

And what did the head of protocol do when she saw this document? Did she report or punish the people who made it? Did she tell them there is zero tolerance for this behavior?

No, she didn't do anything of the sort. In fact, the head of protocol wrote this caption to the image on her Facebook page: ''My marines crack me up.''

It's no wonder that only 13 percent of victims of rape and assault are brave enough to report the crimes committed against them. The ''Hurt Feelings Report'' and the Facebook response convey a toxic culture when it comes to sexual harassment, assault, stalking and rape. Victims have been told to ''get over it,'' or told that they were ''asking for it'' based on the way they dress.

One year ago, I promised to tell the stories of servicemembers who survived rape and sexual assault while in the military. I said then, and I promise you now, that I will tell their stories until meaningful action is taken to eliminate the chasm between the number of estimated sexual assaults and the number of prosecuted sexual assaults.

I urge survivors to email me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov if they want to speak up.

THE DEATH OF TRAYVON MARTIN IS AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, the death of Trayvon Martin is, indeed, an American tragedy. Too often this violent act that resulted in the murder of Trayvon Martin is repeated in the streets of our Nation.

I applaud the young people all across the land who are making a statement about hoodies, about the real hoodlums in this Nation, particularly those who tread on our laws wearing official or quasi-official clothes.

Racial profiling has to stop, Mr. Speaker. Just because someone wears a hoodie does not make them a hoodlum.

The Bible teaches us, Mr. Speaker, in the book of Micah 6:68——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. RUSH. These words:

He has shown you, O man——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair must remind Members of clause 5 of rule XVII. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. RUSH. What is good. What does the Lord require of you? To do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.

In the New Testament, Luke 4:18–20 teaches us these words:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He has anointed me to proclaim the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. RUSH. And to recover sight to the blind, to set the oppressed free.

I urge all who hear these words to heed these lessons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

* * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the prohibition on breaches of decorum.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members that clause 5 of rule XVII prohibits the wearing of hats in the Chamber when the House is in session. The Chair finds that the donning of a hood is not consistent with this rule. Members need to remove their hoods or leave the floor.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America has the best health care system in the world.

Long before coming to Congress, I spent my energy in the life and health insurance field. In selling individual contracts, I found that questions of preexisting conditions and portability were a major concern for people buying individual health insurance contracts.

Over the years, I became convinced that these two major challenges could be solved by breaking down the walls between the individual States. This would provide a much larger pool of applicants, thus allowing for a much more reasonable base to underwrite the cost of covering those preexisting conditions and allowing for more effective portability.

□ 1040

When we debated how to solve the problems affecting our health care system 2 years ago, many were warned that government would go too far and must not be the solution. Our former Speaker said, ''We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.'' Well, now we know what is in it, and it's time to speak up.

Mr. and Mrs. America, do not allow a federally mandated program to undermine the best health care system in the world. Do not allow a Federal mandate to get between you and your physician. Do not allow government to undermine your right to choose between the great variety of protection available in the marketplace. Do not allow a politically appointed board to ration health care in the name of reducing costs. Do not allow the Federal Government to take us down the pathway to socialized medicine. Do not allow us to be dominated by those who would have America look more and more like Europe.

So, Mr. and Mrs. America, it's time for all of us to come together. We can solve the problems of our existing health care system without allowing a bunch of unelected bureaucrats getting between you and great health care.

You need to tell Congress to do their job—solve the problems without destroying the best health care system in the world.

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 41 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

Reverend Dennis Culbreth, First Baptist Church, Jasper, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, I want to thank You so much for the privilege we have to pray to You today. You are the Creator of all. It is through You that we can have hope and we can have grace.

Father, You have blessed our country as no other country has been blessed. I pray, Lord, that You will never let this body forget Your goodness and Your mercy to us all. Guide these legislators in such a way that Your will is promoted throughout the world.

Continue to use our country as a beacon on the hill. It is because of Your mercy our country is a light of hope shining in a lost and a dark world.

Dear Lord, please let us never take this freedom for granted. As these representatives gather from across the Nation, we ask for Your guidance and for Your wisdom as these men and women seek to make decisions that affect the lives of every American here at home and across the world.

And this I pray in Jesus' name, 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.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. REYES 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agree to the request of the House of Representatives that the Senate return to the House the bill (H.R. 5) ''An Act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.''.

WELCOMING REVEREND DENNIS CULBRETH

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor and my privilege this afternoon to welcome our guest chaplain, Dennis Culbreth, who gave today's opening prayer.

Dr. Culbreth, as senior pastor, serves a congregation of 2,400 at First Baptist Church in Jasper, Alabama. Prior to his tenure at First Baptist Church in Jasper, he served congregations across Alabama, Virginia, and Georgia.

In addition to his service within his congregation, Dr. Culbreth has also been an active member of the senior executive leadership team for the North American Mission Board and the Virginia Baptist Convention.

Dr. Culbreth earned his bachelor of arts at Samford University, his master's in divinity at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and his doctorate at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

He is a native of Evergreen, Alabama, and enjoys spending time with his family—his wife, Marybeth, and children

Andrew, Matthew, and Grace—as well as playing an occasional round of golf.

Dr. Culbreth is a devoted and inspired leader in our community, and it's a privilege to have him here today to be with us and to give our opening prayer.

It's my honor to serve him, his family, and his congregation in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama.

Again, I welcome Dr. Culbreth to the United States House of Representatives this afternoon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONVICTED RAPIST COLLECTS MONEY FROM VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the white ribbon campaign's theme is ''No Excuse for Abuse.''

Crystal Harris was raped by her abusive husband, and it was not the first time he hurt her, abused her, or even threatened her. But this particular crime and rape was caught on tape. So, Shawn Harris was convicted and sent to prison for 6 years. It sounds like justice prevailed. The outlaw was put away. But that's not the rest of the story.

A judge ordered that once the sex offender husband gets out of jail for rape, the victim must pay him $1,000 a month in spousal support and, get this, she has to pay the legal bills for the divorce—his legal bills.

The victim has to pay the rapist. It should be the other way around. The criminal should be paying Crystal restitution because rape is never the fault of the victim, and a victim never owes the perpetrator anything.

No judge, no law should force victims to financially support convicted rapists because there is no excuse for abuse.

And that's just the way it is.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the chaplain of the day asked God to look over this Congress. I ask God and think the preacher should have asked for direction a little bit further, to look over the Supreme Court, because the Supreme Court has in its hands the Affordable Care Act.

A report was just issued yesterday that said in my home city of Memphis, African American women are twice as likely to die of breast cancer than Caucasian women. That's unacceptable.

Part of that is because they don't get the health care they need. The Affordable Care Act will see to it that everybody gets access to affordable health care, that there won't be a disparity of twice as much for the cost of insurance for women than men, and that mammograms will be offered to people, ladies, without a co-pay.

If the Affordable Care Act passes, that disparity in health between white women and black women in my city and in America will end. That is wrong.

Part of what's happened in my city is a vestige of Jim Crow, and even though those laws have been repealed, we still suffer from them, and there is a lot in the Affordable Care Act that will end those. I hope the Supreme Court rules on the side of life.

RESTORE THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, I introduced H.R. 4232 with my colleague from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN.

The Restore the Freedom of Information Act is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would make it easier for American taxpayers seeking information from the Federal Government's multibillion-dollar bailout programs.

When the executive branch ceases to function as an arm of the government and begins taking ownership of private enterprise, they should not be able to hide behind the Freedom of Information Act restrictions and keep secret their dealings and the use of taxpayers' dollars.

In the auto bailout, the administration actively took away the pensions of Delphi's salaried retirees and now refuses to release documents to tell the taxpayers how this happened.

Mr. Speaker, whether it's the auto industry, the financial sector, or even a future bailout, taxpayers deserve access to this information, and H.R. 4232 will do just that. The Restore the Freedom of Information Act will ensure that the administration can not continue to hide its decisions from public scrutiny and deny American taxpayers the access they deserve.

□ 1210

BUDGETS ARE ABOUT VALUES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about values. The budget we are about to debate today, the Republican budget, does not reflect American values. It is a budget for the survival of the fittest. It cuts the highest tax bracket from 35 percent to 25 percent. That's going to add $5 trillion to the debt. In order to compensate for that, this budget cuts $5.7 trillion in domestic discretionary spending.

If this budget were ever to become law, it would push back all the progress we've made over generations in terms of malnutrition, in terms of poverty rates, in terms of protecting our seniors. It is a budget that would make Charles Darwin blush. It is a budget not worthy of this House, and it is a budget I hope will be resoundingly rejected because of the values that do not reflect America at its best.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MAMMOTH SPRING HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Mammoth Spring High School boys' basketball team.

This season, the Bears went 36 and 7 and claimed Arkansas' Class 1A State Championship trophy after defeating the Sacred Heart Rebels by a score of 42–39. This is the first ever State championship victory for the boys' basketball team, and it is a great source of pride for the Mammoth Spring community.

I would like to commend Head Coach Jeremy Cude for leading his team to a State championship. Additionally, I would like to recognize players Mason Brown, Seth Brown, Joby Busch, Wayne Coffey, Houston Cooper, Craig Hoover, J.D. Major, Tyler Mullins, Josh Parker, Ryan Roberson, Cortley Rutledge, Dylan Skaggs, A.J. Smith, Matt Turnbough, and Garrett Wooldridge for the leadership they have shown.

Great accomplishments like a State championship don't happen without a great deal of dedication. The Mammoth Spring Bears and their head coach have put Mammoth Spring on the map and have brought a great deal of pride to their community. Now that the boys' basketball team has brought a State championship trophy home to Mammoth Spring, I have no doubt that the players will set new, even higher goals to achieve.

Congratulations once again to the Bears and to the entire Mammoth Spring community for their State championship victory.

CESAR E. CHAVEZ

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

Mr. REYES. Today, I proudly stand and join with millions of Americans in remembering the life and legacy of one of our greatest civil rights pioneers in our Latino community, Cesar Chavez.

An advocate for social justice, Cesar Chavez dedicated his life to giving voice to those who couldn't speak for themselves. Cesar Chavez advocated for strong health care for communities. He advocated for good-paying jobs from which people could lead the kinds of lives that our country cherishes and honors.

Cesar Chavez was a Navy veteran who, perhaps, during World War II was disappointed in the way that segregation existed in the armed services; but it gave him the passion to go out and do the kind of work that today we celebrate: a legacy that was adopted by President Obama from the words of Cesar Chavez, who always thought, ''Si, se puede.'' Yes, we can.

So, today, I proudly stand here and remind us that we have so much to be grateful for from those who have advocated in our respective communities—Cesar Chavez, Martin Luther King, and so many others.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. President Obama's ObamaCare plan not only raises many constitutional questions, but it is creating an environment where younger Americans, like my little nephew, Preston James Hunter, who was born last night, will be forced to live in a world with less choice and higher health care costs.

As the cost of health care rises, we are seeing that taxpayers are on the hook for even more money. We all know that this bill pulled $500 billion out of Medicare, and now we're learning that over the next few years the States are going to have to pay another $620 billion for Medicaid expenditures. Yes, $620 billion for Medicaid expenditures. In Tennessee, my home State, TennCare estimates that the health care law will increase TennCare enrollment by 242,291 people. That is at an extra cost of $225 million a year. Those are just the estimates.

While the President and Democrats in Washington are raiding Medicare, Republicans in the House are fighting back and are working to protect Medicare for our seniors. As for the jobs-killing aspect of ObamaCare, we now find 20 new and increased taxes that are in this bill, taxes that are affecting American families and employers.

We simply cannot afford a forced health care plan that doesn't work, that raises taxes, and that many Americans believe is unconstitutional.

CESAR E. CHAVEZ

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of a great civil activist, Cesar E. Chavez. This week, we celebrate the life of a man who symbolizes dignity and respect and who would have turned 85 years old on March 31.

He was a farm laborer, a leader, a cofounder of the United Farm Workers, and a veteran. He brought social justice to migrant workers and communities, which included better pay, improving housing, outlawing the child labor law, and human dignity. He achieved all of this through the use of nonviolence.

For over 10 years, I have worked to create a national holiday to commemorate Cesar Chavez. Please join me in celebrating the life of a great American hero by supporting my legislation, House Resolution 130, which designates the fourth Friday of every March as Cesar E. Chavez Day.

Martin Luther King, Jr., once telegraphed Cesar Chavez with a message: ''Our separate struggles are really one—a struggle for freedom, for dignity, and for humanity.''

The legacy of Cesar Chavez will continue to inspire not only Latinos but people across our Nation who believe in the American Dream. ''Si, se puede''—yes, we can.

INVESTING IN DOMESTIC ENERGY

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Chicagoland region hit a record—a record high for gas prices. Gas is $4.51 a gallon in the 10th District of Illinois and is about $4.67 in the city of Chicago. At a time when family budgets are stretched to their limits, rising gas prices are contributing to many things, including that of rising food prices and skyrocketing bills at the pump.

My energy plan includes investing in domestic energy and in implementing an all-of-the-above approach because these are bipartisan ideas that we can and should support. Not only will this help reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but it will help create jobs right here at home and lower the cost of energy for small businesses and families across the country.

We must continue to explore environmentally friendly forms of energy while utilizing the resources we have here at home. Let's come together on this important issue so that hard-working taxpayers and hardworking families can be assured that we are listening and are putting their concerns above political rhetoric.

COMMENDING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S COMMITMENT TO MIDDLE CLASS SECURITY

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, over the past 3 years, President Obama has passed legislation, has introduced crucial programs, and has offered important tax incentives to restore economic security to middle class families across our Nation.

Immediately after assuming office, President Obama created a middle class task force that is targeted at raising middle class living standards and at giving the middle class a voice in the White House. President Obama also expanded small business loan programs in order to give small business owners access to credit and in order to boost job creation. He also extended the 2010 payroll tax cut through 2012 to give the average working family $1,000 a year and to give increased Federal student aid to low-income college students.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Obama's bold leadership and vision, and I commend him for his commitment to restoring economic security for our middle class families across America.

FISCAL SOLVENCY UNDER THE REPUBLICAN HOUSE BUDGET

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Our Nation is currently standing at a critical crossroads. Should Washington weigh deeper into the red or should we continue cutting spending and get our Nation on the track towards fiscal solvency under the House Republican budget, which cuts more than $5 trillion while preventing the President's tax increases?

In addition to paving the way for our Nation to get back on track towards economic security and prosperity, the Republican budget also puts forward bipartisan solutions to save and strengthen Medicare for current seniors and for our children and grandchildren.

Under our current trajectory, Medicare will be bankrupt in just a decade. This plan preserves current Medicare plans for those in and nearing retirement while offering guaranteed coverage options for future seniors, including those with preexisting conditions or tough health histories. It is financed by a premium support payment which would provide more assistance to low-income and less healthy seniors. The Medicare plans will compete against one another, which ultimately will create lower costs and a better quality of care.

The budget refuels our economy to create an environment for businesses to grow jobs with fundamental tax reform, protects the security of health and retirement plans, and begins to reduce our deficit now to leave our children with a country free from debt.

□ 1220

REJECT THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal offered by Mr.

RYAN of Wisconsin. My home State of Rhode Island has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. My constituents need commonsense solutions that will create jobs and get our country back on the right track, not another extreme proposal from the House Republican leadership.

Unfortunately, this budget proposal would give the wealthiest Americans an average tax cut of $150,000 while slashing important support for middle class families and investments that we need to grow our economy. And once again, House Republicans are proposing to end the Medicare guarantee for our seniors; in this case, by replacing it with a voucher program that would not be guaranteed to keep pace with rising health care costs, which could result in higher costs for our seniors and less quality of care.

I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

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

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out about an important issue that faces our society: domestic violence and sexual abuse. Our country has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit power to commit violence against men, women, and children.

In an effort to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse, my district kicked off the White Ribbon Campaign last week. The White Ribbon Campaign is led by men and encourages all members of the community—men and women, young and old—to join in their efforts. This male leadership helps to acknowledge the important contributions men have made towards this effort and invites others to take a role.

From March 23 to April 1, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual violence. I encourage my House colleagues to join me in wearing a white ribbon to put a spotlight on this very important issue. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge never to commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against men, women, or children.

FAMILY HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the health of women and their families is threatened. It's threatened not only by a Supreme Court case across the street but by the Republican budget right here in the House.

The Affordable Care Act law protects women from being charged more for health insurance for simply being a woman, and it allows women to get health coverage and not be denied because giving birth may be considered a preexisting condition. And it helps families—mothers and fathers—have a little bit of peace of mind in raising their children.

Last Friday in my district, I met with Kathy Estrada and her son Nick. Kathy and her husband have worked hard and are doing the best they can to raise their son. But as a young man in his twenties, Nick is building a life, and it's incredibly expensive to buy health care insurance. He is a skateboarder, and she used to lay awake at night worrying that something might happen to him out on the streets and she wouldn't be able to take care of him because he couldn't be on her insurance. But because of the affordable care law, Kathy can rest easier because Nick can be covered on her insurance policy. The affordable care law is today helping women and families of all ages across the country, and that's the way it should continue.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, imagine you come to a fork in the road. You look on your GPS, and you see that the path to the left leads to an old bridge that is falling into the river. The path on the right leads to a brand-new bridge that is guaranteed to get your car over the river. Obviously, everyone would go over the new bridge.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Medicare, we have a GPS provided to us by the Medicare trustees. They clearly say that if we stay on the same road, Medicare will be broke by 2024. Republicans want to provide a new bridge that protects and preserves the program for current and future retirees, a program that gives future seniors the option to stay in traditional Medicare or to choose a new plan that best fits their needs.

Unlike current Medicare, the Republican plan provides greater benefits for low-income and sick seniors and requires more from wealthy seniors. The Medicare trustees have put up a bright orange sign saying: ''Bridge Out Ahead.'' We can either heed their warnings and turn down a new path or plow right through and end up in the river.

MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues here in the House to take action and create jobs by bringing Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, or MAP–21, to the House floor for a vote.

Yesterday, for the second time this week, the Republican leadership pulled a short-term highway extension bill. Time is running out, and the ninth extension will be expiring this Saturday, March 31. If Congress does not act by Saturday, millions of construction jobs will be at risk. Gas taxes will not be collected, which can add up to over $90 million a day.

Two weeks ago, MAP–21 successfully passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote of 74–22. While it is not a perfect bill, MAP–21 is fully paid for and is estimated to save 1.8 million jobs and create up to 1 million more jobs. While I would prefer a 5-year transportation bill, MAP–21 is legislation that both Republicans and Democrats can support. A transportation bill will not only improve our infrastructure but will provide jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bring to the floor MAP–21 for a vote.

WE HAVE ONE MORE OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity over at the Supreme Court to witness the oral arguments on the individual mandate. I believe I could tell from the faces of the Justices that there was significant skepticism about this provision of the Affordable Care Act. You know, if we were smart, that skepticism could open the way for thoughtful alternatives by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to preserve and protect Medicare. Speaker PELOSI last year cut $500 billion from Medicare, and the President has placed his bet on a bureaucratic control board, the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

A trustees' report from a year ago suggested that the Medicare trust fund will be exhausted in less than a decade. That doesn't seem like a viable way forward. We've got a budget resolution up this week to preserve and protect Medicare. The Republican action ensures access to care in the future. This House has voted to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and maybe the Senate should take up the same action.

We have to reduce the spending that diverts thought and effort from patient care and free up resources to focus on these patients. We are committed to protecting our seniors and Medicare, lowering the deficit, and creating a workable system that allows for good doctors to help more patients.

REMEMBERING ANTHONY DEJUAN BOATWRIGHT

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, it's with sadness that I rise to honor the life of Anthony Dejuan Boatwright, who passed away at the age of 11 Sunday night. Juan was 14 months old when he was left alone at his day care center, fell into a bucket of water and bleach, and suffered irreversible brain damage. At that time, there was no law requiring Georgia licensed day care centers to carry insurance or even let parents know that they didn't carry insurance. That meant that despite being awarded a $30 million jury verdict, Juan's family couldn't collect the money needed to care for Juan's life over the past 11 years.

Juan's mother, Jackie, has led a courageous effort to correct this injustice. And in 2004, Georgia enacted a law requiring that day care centers disclose their insurance status. Last Congress, Juan and Jackie's fight led the House to pass the Anthony Dejuan Boatwright Act so that families across America would never again experience the same tragedy.

During the last 11 years, Juan inspired a movement to protect the safety of children everywhere. Juan, your mother and I thank you for your life. You will be missed, but your legacy lives on.

AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY TO POWER THIS NATION

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the President's road to ''Regulation Nation'' is truly never ending. Just yesterday, the EPA announced their latest set of regulations which will effectively ban the building of any new coal-fired power plants. This regulation comes on the heels of some of the most costly regulations in the history of the EPA, including the Utility MACT and Boiler MACT rules. He promised that his energy policies would mean ''electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket,'' one promise the President has kept.

Coal is one of our most plentiful resources. Over 50 percent of our energy is provided by coal. We can no longer allow the White House to regulate this country into an energy crisis. It's time we start to take advantage of all the God-given natural resources this country has and have American-made energy power this Nation.

□ 1230

OPPOSE THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I'm troubled by the Republican budget's effect on health care, specifically the provisions that would eliminate the Affordable Care Act. Passing the Republican budget would be detrimental to the health of citizens across the United States, but it's particularly harmful to women.

As we mark the anniversary of the Affordable Care Act, we can measure its successes by the benefits that women have already realized: preventive care is guaranteed, gender rating will soon be gone, and access to contraceptives has expanded. This expansion is important for all women, not just those women who use contraceptives for birth control.

My colleagues will share stories of women who have been put at risk by this budget. I would like to share the story of Julie, an Oregonian whose contraceptives are important to her health on a daily basis to treat endometriosis. Without contraceptives, Julie would suffer from extreme pain and the risk of infertility. Under the Republican budget, her access to this medication could be in jeopardy.

It is unconscionable to deny women access to treatments that can improve the quality of their lives, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for women and oppose the Republican budget.

THE EPA IS OVERSTEPPING ITS BOUNDS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. I rise today to bring attention once again to this administration's assault on our domestic energy production.

For the past 3 years, I've been saying many times from this very podium that the EPA is overstepping its bounds and regulating where it cannot legislate and costing us American jobs.

Last Friday evening, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia overruled the EPA's veto of the Spruce Mine's Clean Water Act permit. The decision stated—and this is a quote from the judge—that the EPA's veto was ''unprecedented'' and it had acted in a manner that was ''arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with the law.'' Could there be a clearer sign that we've been subjected to an overreach of Executive power?

This decision is a win for West Virginia, but we have a long way to go because the administration's so-called energy policies have led to higher gas prices and higher heating prices.

We're blessed to have abundant natural resources in this country, particularly in my State of West Virginia, but this becomes irrelevant if this administration continues to hold these domestic resources hostage. All-of-the-above means following the law.

MEDICARE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many people are smiling about the argument in the Supreme Court on the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, but I will tell you those children born with sickle cell and asthma are praying that ObamaCare survives. Those elderly persons who fall into the doughnut hole with Medicare part D are praying for ObamaCare to survive. I am as well, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in a humanitarian approach in service to our Nation: Help those who cannot help themselves.

As we look forward to a vigorous debate on this Republican budget, I hope that we stand together against ending Medicare, destroying jobs, and moving forward on the lopsided help that we give to the wealthy over the poor.

VICTIMIZING THE VICTIM

I also want to say that Trayvon Martin's parents were here yesterday, and I want to stand against victimizing the victim. We say to them in a forceful way that it is important for justice to be done, that justice is to assure the arrest of Mr. Zimmerman, who will not be alleged guilty but will be innocent until proven guilty.

Now is the time to heal this Nation and to recognize that this case must move forward with justice for a little boy.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Senator LIEBERMAN, an Independent from Connecticut, said: ''The truth is we cannot save Medicare as we know it. We can save Medicare only if we change it.''

I agree with Senator LIEBERMAN.

My mother is on Medicare, and I want to ensure care for our senior citizens by maintaining this program for those currently on Medicare and preserving it for future generations.

Our budget, which we will vote on tomorrow, saves Medicare for current and future generations with no disruptions for those in and near retirement.

Our reforms are not partisan. In fact, they are based on a bipartisan proposal by Chairman RYAN and Senator RON WYDEN, a Democrat of Oregon.

I urge my colleagues to support the GOP budget tomorrow because failure to take action to save this program today poses the greatest threat to the health and retirement security of America's seniors.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, for too long, women have faced discrimination at the hands of insurance companies who label pregnancy as a preexisting condition and then deny coverage or charge more for it.

Erin from Chicago writes:

When I found out I was pregnant, I had full insurance coverage. I was told, however, that I did not have a pregnancy rider and therefore my pregnancy would not be covered.

How can I pay for health insurance that will not cover a vital part of a woman's life? I was asked if I wanted to purchase the rider that would not take effect for over 365 days.

Thanks to ObamaCare, insurers will no longer be able to get away with this. Beginning in 2014, insurers cannot deny or charge more for any preexisting condition, and that would include pregnancy.

A DEJA VU BUDGET

(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, here we go again. It's deja vu all over again.

Simply put, the Ryan-Romney Republican budget ends Medicare. AARP said: ''The proposal lacks balance and jeopardizes the health and economic security of older Americans.''

The budget we will consider this week fails the test of balance, fairness, and shared responsibility. It showers the few Americans that are the very wealthy with an average tax cut of at least $150,000, while preserving giveaways to Big Oil companies and Wall Street CEOs.

What's worse is that all these tax breaks would be paid for by ending Medicare and cutting education, basic research, and new sources of energy.

Obviously, this budget rejects all of our American values.

This is not the first time the other side has tried to end Medicare. They tried it last year, too. The American people rejected the Ryan proposal then and they will reject this latest attack on our middle class now.

THE 2013 BUDGET AND MEDICARE

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

Ms. CHU. Budgets are about priorities. I think it should be about helping people climb the ladder of opportunity so they can live a good middle class life, the American Dream.

But the Republican budget hurts the middle class. It provides billions in tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, Big Oil, and special interests. Millionaires get an extra $150,000 in their pockets in tax cuts.

How do the Republicans pay for this? This is how:

They take some by slashing education and leaving 10 million students with less money for college. They steal some from our future economy, gutting investments in science and technology. But Republicans do the most damage to seniors. They end the Medicare guarantee. They shift medical costs to seniors. They basically let Medicare wither on the vine.

These aren't my priorities or those of the American people. That's why I oppose the Republican budget.

□ 1240

JUSTICE FOR TRAYVON MARTIN

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I rise to thank those Members and witnesses who joined together yesterday to discuss the tragic shooting of Trayvon Martin: Representatives CONYERS, JACKSON LEE, BROWN, BARBARA LEE, RICHMOND, NADLER, JOHNSON, GREEN, QUIGLEY, RUSH, DEUTCH, YVETTE CLARKE, DANNY DAVIS, CARSON, MEEKS, SEWELL, RICHARDSON, WATERS, CHU, and COHEN.

I cannot tell you how comforting it was, Mr. Speaker, to his parents and to everyone there to see such sharp, very strong support from this body. Together, we can continue to apply pressure in this case of Trayvon Martin, a little boy from my district, District 17, Miami-Dade County, Florida; and together we can make a difference. Thirty-two days and still no justice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1339) to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1339

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

SECTION 1. OFFICIAL DESIGNATION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 1629, Captain John Endicott organized the first militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem.

(2) The colonists had adopted the English militia system, which required all males between the ages of 16 and 60 to possess arms and participate in the defense of the community.

(3) In 1636, the Massachusetts General Court ordered the organization of three militia regiments, designated as the North, South, and East regiments.

(4) These regiments drilled once a week and provided guard details each evening to sound the alarm in case of attack.

(5) The East Regiment, the predecessor of the 101st Engineer Battalion, assembled as a regiment for the first time in 1637 on the Salem Common, marking the beginning of the Massachusetts National Guard and the National Guard of the United States.

(6) Since 1785, Salem's own Second Corps of Cadets (101st and 102nd Field Artillery) has celebrated the anniversary of that first muster.

(7) As the policy contained in section 102 of title 32, United States Code, clearly expresses, the National Guard continues its historic mission of providing units for the first line defense of the United States and current missions throughout the world.

(8) The designation of the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States will contribute positively to tourism and economic development in the city, create jobs, and instill pride in both the local and State communities.

(b) DESIGNATION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS NATIONAL GUARD BIRTHPLACE.—In light of the findings made in subsection (a), the City of Salem, Massachusetts, is hereby designated as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) MILITARY CEREMONIAL SUPPORT.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Council of Governors, and the Adjutant General of the State of Massachusetts, shall provide military ceremonial support at the dedication of any monument, plaque, or other form of official recognition placed in Salem, Massachusetts, celebrating the designation of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.

(2) FUNDING SOURCE.—Federal funds may not be used to design, procure, prepare, install, or maintain any monument, plaque, or other form of official recognition placed in Salem, Massachusetts, celebrating the designation of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, but the Adjutant General of the State of Massachusetts may accept and expend contributions of non-Federal funds for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1339, recognizing the city of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States. I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN TIERNEY, for bringing this measure before the House, and I'm honored to be a cosponsor of this legislation with him.

It was in 1629 that Captain John Endicott organized the first militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem and that all males between the ages of 16 and 60 participated in the defense of that community. Each week, this first regiment diligently practiced drill and provided guard detail to protect the colony throughout each night. This militia, and those that followed, would come to play a significant role in the Revolutionary War and all conflicts that have followed.

Today, the National Guard continues its proud mission of providing units for the first line in defense of our great Nation at home and throughout the world. By designating the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, we hope to see positive tourism and economic developments in the city, a city already recognized throughout the world as one of immense historical significance.

But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this resolution will instill pride in both the local and State communities in their rich patriotic heritage and properly recognizes the critically important role that the National Guard has played in defense of our Nation and its citizens since the earliest days of our Nation.

As the oldest component of the Armed Forces of the United States, the services our National Guard has provided our country are innumerable and immense. I'm honored to be here today to be part of the history in the formal recognition of this, the National Guard's birthplace. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer my support for H.R. 1339, recognizing the great city of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States. I'd like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for bringing this important measure, of which I am an original cosponsor, before the House.

The National Guard has provided over 370 years of dedicated service to our country. Beginning in 1629, when the first militia was organized in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem by Captain John Endicott, the National Guard has played a key role in protecting the Nation and responding to contingencies around the globe. The National Guard is the oldest component of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The patriots who founded our Nation followed English military tradition and organized their able-bodied male citizens into militias. All males between the ages of 16 and 60 were expected to maintain arms and participate in the defense of the community. The colonial militias protected their countrymen from foreign invaders and helped to win the Revolutionary War. Following the war, our Forefathers empowered Congress to ''provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia.'' However, recognizing the militia's State role, the Founding Fathers reserved the appointment of officers and training of the militia to the States. Today's National Guard still remains a dual State-Federal force.

The service of our Guard is just as vital today as it was in the days of our Forefathers. The Guard deployed more than 50,000 troops in support of the gulf States following Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Tens of thousands of Guard members have served in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, the National Guard continues its historic dual mission, responding to State and local emergencies while ably and courageously serving our Nation overseas in times of war alongside their Active Duty and Reserve counterparts.

So I am proud to stand here today to recognize Salem, Massachusetts, as a city of great historical significance in the birthplace of our National Guard. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), the author of the underlying legislation.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding, as well as for taking the time to help manage this bill and for being an original cosponsor; and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, as well, for cosponsoring this bill and for his kind words in discussion of what it is and how meaningful it is not just to Salem, Massachusetts, but to the country as well.

I rise in support of this bill to officially recognize Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard. Salem was the site where our country's first military regiment mustered. This militia was the foundation of what would eventually become the National Guard.

Last year, I offered a version of this legislation as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill, and it was approved by a voice vote. Unfortunately, my amendment was not included as part of the final conference report. So for the past several months, we've been working together to bring this bill to the floor.

Next month is the 375th anniversary of that first muster on Salem Common, and it's being commemorated; so I'm particularly pleased that the House is considering this bill at this time. I want to be clear: consideration of this bill today is made possible because of bipartisan support; and just like my two colleagues here, there are a number of people, over 116 cosponsors from both parties, who participated in bringing this bill. I want to thank the majority leader, as well as the leadership on both sides, for his courtesy given to the staff as well as to me. I also want to thank the House Armed Services Committee chairman, BUCK MCKEON, as well as the ranking member, ADAM SMITH, and their staffs; and I want to note the 116 colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, all the Democrats on the Armed Service Committee and a substantial number of Republicans on that committee for their support.

This kind of consideration is just the way this House should behave and should act, and I'm glad that we were able to do it on this bill.

So today is an important day for the City of Salem and for the National Guard and for local residents like Larry Conway and many others who have been advocating for this designation for years. Designating Salem as the Birthplace of the National Guard will pay tribute to those who first organized to defend our country almost 375 years ago, and it will also honor those men and women who continue to serve in the National Guard today.

We are working closely with our Senate counterparts to ensure that that Chamber acts quickly in time for the 375th anniversary next month. I won't recount all of the details my colleagues here were so kind to enumerate, but I do note that the bill itself sets forth all the important benchmarks and the progress that we've made.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues, and I urge all the colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

□ 1250

Mr. PLATTS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add, again, my words of thanks and commendation to the gentleman from Massachusetts for sponsoring this resolution. Because, as was reflected, in honoring the birthplace of the National Guard, we honor all who have served throughout our Nation's history.

During my statehouse days, as well as now in Congress, I've had the remarkable privilege to interact with both my Air and Army National Guard in Pennsylvania, as well as National Guard troops from around the country in my many visits to Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere. These are remarkable, remarkable men and women, citizen soldiers through and through, who, when called upon, respond to the call of their Nation and their fellow citizens, serve us so courageously.

So, again, I'm honored to be a sponsor of this resolution, and I commend the gentleman for introducing it.

I urge a ''yes'' vote in support of its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1339, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court for the State of California, North Valley District in connection with a civil case currently pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that because the subpoena is not ''material and relevant,'' compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 597 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 597

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Hinchey of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 29, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure extending expiring surface transportation authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, it's budget day. It's budget day, and we get to begin that in the Rules Committee.

Now, I have the great pleasure in this body, as a freshman, of serving on both the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee, so you can imagine the sincerity with which I bring my enthusiasm to the floor today.

Coming here as a freshman who believes in an open process, who believes that we ought to have the opportunity to bring all ideas before the American people and let the 435 Members of the people's House express their opinion, I'm proud to tell you that the rule that is before us today allows for not one budget to be debated, not two budgets to be debated, not three, not four, not five, and not six, Mr. Speaker; but the rule that we bring today allows for seven different visions of the United States budget to be brought before this institution and debated. That is every single budget that was introduced, offered yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in front of the Rules Committee.

Candidly, had more Members submitted budgets, had we had 11, had we had 12, we would have made those in order, too, because this debate that we will have over these next 2 days, Mr. Speaker, is a debate about the vision that we have in this body for this country. I am so proud of the vision that was voted, reported out of the Budget Committee, and that will be made in order by this rule.

The options we'll have before us, Mr. Speaker, as made in order by this rule, include the President's budget. You may remember last year, Mr. Speaker, the President submitted his budget to Congress and not a single Member of the House offered that budget on the floor. It was offered in the Senate. It didn't get any votes. It was defeated 97–0, but it was offered there. This year, we're going to be able to look at the President's budget and debate that here on the floor of the House for the first time in my term.

We're going to have a budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus today that lays out a vision for America, that talks about taxation, that talks about revenues and spending and where we should prioritize. We have a bipartisan budget that's been introduced, Mr. Speaker, that will come before the floor of this House, again, to be debated in its entirety. We have the Progressive Caucus budget that's coming. We have the Republican Study Committee budget that is coming. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the Democratic Caucus substitute that is coming, all to compete with, in this grand arena of ideas, the budget that we reported out of the Budget Committee.

I see my colleague from Wisconsin, with whom I have the great pleasure of serving on the Budget Committee. We went through amendment after amendment—some 30 amendments offered and considered, debated, some with bipartisan support, some with bipartisan opposition—to create this one budget that will be the foundation for the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, if this rule is enacted.

I don't know how we could have done it any better in the Rules Committee. I hope that's what we'll hear from my friend from New York.

Again, every single budget that was offered—and that was the invitation put out by the Speaker, just to be clear. The openness and the invitation was, Mr. Speaker: Come one, come all. If you have a competing vision, send it to the Rules Committee. We'll make it in order on the floor so that we can have the kind of open debate that's going to make America proud.

□ 1300

This is the beginning of that, right here, Mr. Speaker, right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for his kindness yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee did fine. It was open, and it allowed all the budgets, as he said, to be brought to the floor. It's what we have to work with that is concerning to me because the budget's a reflection of our values and, through that prism, the Ryan budget that we're considering today is morally bankrupt.

The budget that the majority proposes today puts corporations and the wealthiest Americans above the needs of working and middle class families. It increases military spending while slashing the safety net for the middle class and protects tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas.

In short, this extreme, partisan proposal takes a hatchet to the notion of shared responsibility and places the financial burdens of a generation upon the shoulders of seniors, the poor, and the middle class.

Under this budget, the millionaires will receive multiple tax cuts totaling at least $300,000, and not a single corporate tax loophole will be closed.

Under this budget, we would see the end of Medicare as we know it. In its place, seniors would be offered the option of a fixed price voucher with which they may go into the market to find their own insurance, with no guarantee that the voucher you receive will come even close to covering the cost of the health care.

Meanwhile, the landmark Affordable Care Act, which is the first law to start addressing the soaring cost of health care, would be repealed. Repeal of the law would mean that children under 26 could no longer be insured by their parents, and millions of Americans suffering from chronic diseases could once again be denied care.

I don't think many Americans—certainly, I didn't know it—understand—I learned this during the Clinton health care debate—that most policies have a yearly and a lifetime limit. As a matter of fact, at that time, when we were debating the Clinton health care plan, that limit was about $1 million, which means that an emergency like head trauma from a car accident, a bike accident, or just a workplace error on a construction site, could lead you to reaching your limit, and you would no longer be eligible for health insurance.

Let me say that in another way. Once you reach that limit with your preexisting condition, you would be uninsurable in the United States for the rest of your life. The health care bill that everybody's talking about now does away with that, both yearly limits and lifetime limits.

Right now, most individuals still face this danger, but thanks to the Affordable Care Act, lifetime and yearly limits will be phased out in 2014. That's a very important part of this bill.

People who want to repeal health care have said absolutely nothing about what they expect to replace it with. We would assume that people with preexisting conditions could no longer get coverage.

Under the Republican budget, those protections would be taken away, and the vulnerable Americans would be left to figure out how to survive on their own.

We talk about the mandate to buy insurance. Right now, under the present law, we are all paying for people who are uninsured. Those people who choose not to buy insurance, who have to go to the hospital for emergencies, or any other reason, are paid for, they are treated, by the law, but we pay the cost. It is estimated in some areas that we spend $1,000 a year more, those of us who are insured, simply to cover the uninsured.

Now, you can continue doing that and paying everybody else's health care costs, or we can keep this health care bill which is so important to us.

The Republican budget not only takes from the poor and gives to the rich, it even fails to fulfill the promise of a balanced budget.

Just this morning, Politico published an article entitled, ''Ryan plan puts GOP in long-term budget bind.'' In the article, the author writes:

> It is a bold, even bellicose election-year challenge. But the strict revenue limits could postpone for a generation the conserve promise of a balanced budget.

Even the majority themselves admit this plan will add $3.11 trillion to our deficit between 2013 and 2022.

Under the majority's plan, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that all government spending, except for Social Security and paying down the debt, will have to be cut by one-third in order to balance the budget by 2040.

This draconian approach means that seniors and the poor will receive worse health care, our children will continue to learn in crumbling schools, and we will all travel, as usual, on a failing transportation network with bridges that are substandard and roads that are cracking, that is inefficient and totally out of date.

This vision does not reflect the ideals of a better America nor the hopes for a brighter future. It is neither a reflection of the values that I hold dear nor the values of the people that whom I represent.

I join many of my colleagues in supporting the Democrat alternative being offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The Democrat alternative budget supports the creation of jobs in the high-tech and construction fields. It invests in our future by prioritizing education, as we must, also prioritizing health and the economy, and reduces the deficit through responsible spending cuts, with revenue raised by having everyone pay their fair share and by closing corporate tax loopholes.

The Democrat alternative is a thoughtful, balanced approach, one that does not place the entire burden of sacrifice on the backs of seniors, the poor, and the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the misguided and dangerous proposal before us and, instead, consider one of the numerous alternatives that protect the middle class while reducing our deficit in a responsible way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

[From POLITICO.com, Mar. 27, 2012]

RYAN PLAN PUTS GOP IN LONG-TERM BIND

(By David Rogers)

Call it the 19 percent solution.

As House debate begins Wednesday, that's the bottom line of the new Republican budget blueprint, which breaks with the August debt accords and substitutes a vision of capping revenue at 19 percent of gross domestic product and scaling back government to fit into that suit.

It's a bold, even bellicose election-year challenge. But the strict revenue limits could postpone for a generation the conservative promise of a balanced budget. At the same time, deep cuts to health care and education most likely will make it harder for GOP frontrunner Mitt Romney to appeal to independents and women voters in the presidential campaign.

Indeed, it's a tight box that Republicans have put themselves in and one that literally requires a transformation of government to escape.

Just an upward adjustment of revenue to 20.25 percent of GDP would bring Washington into balance by 2023 under the same House plan. But the party's anti-tax stance precludes that, and it is not until 17 years later that an extended forecast by the Congressional Budget Office shows a modest surplus in 2040.

By that date, all government spending—except Social Security and payments on the debt—would have had to have been cut by more than a third to reach this goal. Even in the wake of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the budget tilts heavily toward defense spending at the expense of domestic appropriations.

In a show of unity, Romney endorsed the House plan last week, but his campaign ducked questions from POLITICO this week. If elected president, he would face almost immediate pressure to cut nondefense appropriations by 20 percent in his first budget, rolling back spending to a level that predates George W. Bush's administration.

''It's not the budget I would have written,'' Rep. Mike Simpson told POLITICO. And the Idaho Republican—and former speaker of his state Legislature—represents an increasingly restless element in the party going forward.

It was Simpson's vote that allowed Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) to get the resolution out of his committee last week—and Simpson will stand again with the leadership on the floor. But there's no hiding the fact that he and many Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee are furious with the course taken in this budget and more willing to lend support to those who feel revenue must also be part of the equation.

''This is going to be the most partisan debate of the year and it will set up the election for the year,'' Simpson said. ''But I don't think it's the balanced plan to get us out of the hole we are in. Ultimately, the only thing that is going to solve this problem is not a Republican plan, not a Democratic plan, but a bipartisan plan that has buy-in from both sides. That's when we stop going out and shooting one another.''

An early test in this week's floor debate could be the fate of a new entry sponsored by Reps. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.) and Steve LaTourette (R-Ohio), also a member of the Appropriations panel.

Their proposal would present an updated version of the 2010 presidential debt commission's recommendations, a combination of entitlement savings and $1.2 trillion in revenue over 10 years. And having shied away in the past, Cooper told POLITICO that he was now encouraged enough by the reception to proceed—the first real time the ideas have been put to a floor vote.

''My view is this is where they are going to wind up at the end of the year anyway, so we might as well start talking about it,'' LaTourette said. ''Anybody who thinks you are not going to have to have a pot of revenue and pot of cuts is thinking funny.''

Matched against this fragile center will be more traditional warring alternatives on the right and left.

The Republican Study Committee Tuesday announced its menu of still deeper appropriations cuts and Medicaid savings—all in the hopes of reaching balance in five years. At the same time, the Congressional Black Caucus weighed in with a deficit-reduction package that also exceeds Ryan's plan but is heavily dependent on what appears to be $3.9 trillion in additional revenue—including a novel financial speculation tax—not in the White House's own budget.

Republicans hope to embarrass President Barack Obama by having one of their own call up the White House's February budget submission—for certain defeat. And the House Rules Committee late Tuesday made in order such a proposal to be offered by Rep. Mick Mulvaney (R-S.C.), who already is backing both Ryan and the more severe RSC alternative.

Democrats will have their own alternative claiming greater war savings than Obama's—it would end all overseas contingency operations funding after 2014, for example. But the 10-year deficits are still almost double those in the Ryan plan, and Republicans jumped on the fact that the resolution cancels the $1.2 trillion sequester mechanism under the Budget Control Act—without spelling out a clear substitute.

By contrast, the Ryan resolution would also tamper with the first round of automatic cuts due in January but seeks to offset most of these reductions, about half of which would come from defense appropriations.

Six House committees would be ordered to come up with prescribed savings by the end of next month for floor action in May. Armed Services is exempted, frustrating the design of the Budget Control Act, and there is the risk of splitting even traditionally bipartisan panels, like the House Agriculture Committee.

Ryan's budget demands savings of more than $8 billion in 2013 from Agriculture—an effort to target food stamps. And the challenge for Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) is to navigate these waters without jeopardizing the partnership he wants with the minority in writing a farm bill later this year.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I think the gentlelady from New York is right on target. I mean, these budgets are moral documents. They talk about our priorities as a people.

I tell folks back home, Mr. Speaker, and we don't have any young people on the floor with us today, but for all those young folks who are entrepreneurs, Mr. Speaker, who want to go out, and they don't want to work for the Man, they want to go out and hang out their own shingle, run their own business; you know, if they lost, at their small business, beginning on the day Jesus Christ was born, $1 million a day, and they lost $1 million a day at that small business every single day from the day Jesus was born, 7 days a week, through today, Mr. Speaker, they would have to continue to lose $1 million a day every day, 7 days a week for another 700 years to lose their first trillion dollars. Their first trillion.

And the budgets that have been passed by this House and by the United States Senate and signed by Presidents of both parties have saddled our young people today in America with more than $15 trillion—not $1 trillion, Mr. Speaker—$15 trillion and climbing, soon to be 16.

So when we talk about the morality of our budgets, we've got to talk about the morality of continuing to run budgets that are unbalanced. We've got to talk about the morality of continuing to pay for our priorities today with IOUs from our children in the future. We've got to talk about the prosperity that we experience today that we're trading away the prosperity of the future to have.

Health care, Mr. Speaker. It's going on right across the street. The longest line in Washington, D.C., today is right out there at the Supreme Court, folks who want to get in and find out what's going to happen.

Well, the budget that makes up the foundation of this debate that we'll have assumes the President's health care bill is going to go away. It assumes the Supreme Court Justices will accurately conclude that this mandate is unconstitutional, that the whole house of cards unfolds beyond that, and we'll start again.

And you know what's interesting?

Again, I'm so proud to be a member of this Budget Committee that I do think is doing it better than we have done it in the past under both parties. You know, had the President's health care bill come to the floor of this House five pages at the time, 10 pages at the time, 20 pages at the time, I would wager that this House would have passed the majority of it. In fact, I would wager that the American people would have approved and been enthusiastic about the majority of it.

But what has happened in this House too often, Mr. Speaker, is that we take those policies that we can all agree on, and for some reason unbeknownst to me, we decide that it would be bad if we all agreed on good policy, and so we begin to stuff things in there that we know are going to create controversy.

□ 1310

We just manufacture an argument that we don't have to have, and that's what happened to the President's health care bill. There was this nugget of the individual mandate, that theft of freedom, a new definition about what it means to be an American. We knew that the body wouldn't support that so we began to add on sweetener after sweetener after sweetener. We could have just voted on those sweeteners.

This rule doesn't put up with that, Mr. Speaker. This rule says we're not going to try to buy anybody's vote on the floor, we're not going to try to hide the ball in these budgets. Every single Member of Congress who has a vision of America, who has a vision of the morality that my colleague from New York discussed, who has a vision of what we could be as a people if only we had the political will to implement it right here. Each and every Member of Congress was invited to put that vision forward.

There are at least two visions that we'll have today, Mr. Speaker, and tomorrow that I plan to support, visions that I think outline that correct vision of how we can retain America's economic prosperity, how we can continue to be a leader in the free world.

But I support bringing to the floor those budgets that I do not believe in because just because those folks in north metro Atlanta, Mr. Speaker, just because those folks in the Seventh District of Georgia that I represent don't approve of every budget doesn't mean that those budgets don't deserve a vote, and that is a fundamental difference between the leadership that this Speaker has brought to this Institution and the leadership that we have had from both parties in years past.

What we've said is every single idea is worthy of consideration—win or lose. Win or lose, bring those ideas to the floor for debate, and let's see where the votes fall.

Mr. Speaker, again, as a member of both the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee, I am strongly supportive of the underlying budget bill but particularly proud of this rule that makes every other budget option in order as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the majority's misguided budget.

Forty-seven years ago when seniors were the most uninsured group in our Nation, we made a promise that their health care would be guaranteed; and because of that promise, millions of older Americans today have quality, affordable health care, and they and their families have peace of mind. But the majority's budget seems to break that promise by ending Medicare as we know it.

Instead of a guarantee, seniors would get a hope and a prayer, otherwise known as a voucher. This voucher, fixed in price, would be worth less and less each year, and health care costs incurred by individual seniors would increase by at least $6,000 a year.

Their plan would raise Medicare's eligibility age, delaying the promise of a sound retirement for millions of working Americans, and the bill would whack away at Medicaid which provides long-term care for low-income seniors and the disabled and pass the buck to cash-strapped States where its future would be uncertain in tough budgetary times like today.

Mr. Speaker, those promoting this plan to end Medicare argue that we have no choice if we want to bring down our deficits, but their plan doesn't bring down health care costs. It just shifts those costs onto the backs of our Nation's seniors.

Today's seniors will lose important benefits that they currently enjoy today, like access to free preventive screenings and reduced prescription drug costs through the closing of the doughnut hole under ObamaCare, a term I am proud to use. The plan would weaken Medicare itself. As the voucher program draws off healthier, younger seniors, it leaves behind the oldest and sickest, those the private insurance market won't cover.

This plan will cause untold harm to our Nation's seniors and their families who today rely upon Medicare for the promise of quality, affordable health care.

You know, 47 years ago we did make a promise, a promise that is working for millions of American seniors and their families. We cannot break that promise. I urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's budget, the Ryan budget.

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

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from California, and I know her concern for America's seniors is heartfelt, and it's one that I share as well; and I hope that she will support this rule that allows for a series of votes on many different Medicare solutions. Some solutions are better than others; but even if she opposes the underlying budget, I do hope we'll have her support on the rule, because we do lay out the opportunity for folks to choose among seven different visions for solving the Medicare challenge.

I don't have the charts with me down here on the floor. I know my colleagues on the Budget Committee will bring them during the main debate; but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I can picture the charts in my mind, if you charted Medicare spending going out from 2020 to 2050, that two-generation horizon heading out there, and you charted the President's commitment to spend dollars on Medicare, and you charted the Budget Committee's commitment to spend dollars on Medicare, you'd find that the dollar value commitment is about dollar-for-dollar going out over that 30-year window.

So the question then, Mr. Speaker, is not about how much money is this Congress committing, the question is to what priorities is this Congress committing that money.

Now, the President's budget, which we'll have an opportunity to debate and vote here on the floor of the House, turns those Medicare financing decisions, those decisions about how to save money in the system, over to what we've all come to know as IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, to make recommendations and suggestions about how to clamp down on costs.

Now, generally, that means clamping down on reimbursements to doctors.

What the Budget Committee budget does, Mr. Speaker, is give those dollars to individuals so the individuals can enter the marketplace—not a free-for-all marketplace—but a regulated and guaranteed marketplace where policies are guaranteed to these seniors so that individuals can then control those dollars and make their own choices about health care decisions.

So just to be clear, we're not arguing about dollars and cents in Medicare. The President's vision and the Budget Committee's vision is virtually identical.

What we are talking about, though, is who controls those dollars. Are they controlled by a one-size-fits-all 1965 Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan, soon to be revised by the IPAB board, or are they controlled by my mother and my father and your mother and your father and our neighbors, our aunts and uncles, individuals, Americans who will make those health care decisions for themselves.

Again, for me that choice is clear. Individual freedom will always be my choice over government control.

But getting back to the actual rule, Mr. Speaker, that's what's so wonderful about the way this Rules Committee has operated and this resolution that we have before us today. You're not restricted to just voting on my vision of solutions for this country. We're offering six other visions as well. In fact, we're offering every single vision that has come out of this U.S. House of Representatives so that we can have a free, open, and honest debate and let the American people know what their true choices for freedom are.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I was just saying to the previous speaker that I have a 98-year-old mother. Let's hand her a voucher and say, Go figure it out. That's precisely what you want to do. Go figure it out on Medicare. Unbelievable. She could really figure it out.

Chairman RYAN and the House majority have put together a lopsided budget, tries to break the middle class, gouges deeply into our commonsense national priorities and ends the Medicare guarantee.

According to estimates, more than 4 million Americans would lose their jobs because of this budget, but they provide a $150,000 tax cut to the richest 1 percent of people in this Nation.

The Republican budget would slash the social safety net cutting the food stamp program by over 17 percent, or $133.5 billion. That's more than the amount of food stamp funds going to 29 States and territories. Over 8 million men, women, and children would go hungry. If their plan to turn food stamps into an underfunded block grant goes through, even more damage is done. Coming out of the deepest recession since the Great Depression, food stamps help to feed 46 million Americans, 21 million children. Seventy-five percent of the program participants are families with children.

This is Robin Hood in reverse. It takes from the middle class, gives to the rich. I urge my colleagues to oppose this disastrous budget.

□ 1320

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

I would like to say to my friend from Connecticut, because I can see her passion—again, I know it comes from the heart—your mother will be in no way affected by the budget that we're voting on today, and I would like to make that clear if anybody else is concerned about their mothers. For folks who are aged 55 or older, there is not one word in the Republican budget plan that changes the commitment that we've made to folks over the past three or four decades. That commitment since 1965 remains as solid today and tomorrow under the Budget Committee budget as it has ever been.

The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to take our 98-year-old mothers and turn them over to IPAB. Now, again, there are choices here. The Republican budget, which has become the House Budget Committee budget, allows everyone in the current Medicare system and those 55 years of age or older to experience no changes whatsoever to that program guaranteed from 1965. Because the dollars still have to be regulated and because we still have to protect this program from bankruptcy, which is a program important to so many of us, the alternative is to turn it over to this government board and to let them cut costs where they can.

Let me tell you a story, Mr. Speaker, if I can just take a moment of personal privilege.

I was talking with a physician from back home in Gwinnett County, my hometown. He is a neurologist, Mr. Speaker. He has been practicing neurology for 17 years, and he is the youngest neurologist in the county. This is one of the largest counties in the State of Georgia, which is one of the largest States in the Nation, and we haven't had one new neurologist coming into our area in 17 years. This doc says he's thinking about getting out. He has got an uncle who is a primary care physician in south Georgia, a primary care physician who is the only one to accept Medicaid, Mr. Speaker, in a five-county radius.

Folks say that there is this guarantee of health care. Let me tell you, if you can't find a doctor who will take you, your insurance card isn't worth much.

What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to restore the promise of America's health care system. What is it about the American health care system that's driving our doctors into retirement? Is it that we're not clamping down enough and that if only we had the IPAB board clamp down even more that it's going to increase access to care? I tell you that it's not, Mr. Speaker.

There are lots of different ways to prepare budgets, and I didn't know what to expect when I got on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. I'll be honest. It could easily degenerate into a political exercise. I've seen it happen. It could become all about the right talking points and about all the right focus group conversations and have nothing to do with how we should actually lead this country forward—but not so on the Chairman PAUL RYAN Budget Committee. In meeting after meeting, in conversation after conversation, in argument after argument, this Budget Committee chairman said there is one way to do a budget, and that is to do a budget with honest numbers and honest priorities that lay out in plain vision, for all to see, our vision of America's future—and he did it. He did it. He did it with the help of a very competent Budget Committee.

Again, as I look to my friend from Wisconsin with whom I share the bottom dais there on the Budget Committee, he did it with lots of input and lots of conversation; but he did it in a way so that no one would say they're just gaming the numbers, so that no one would say this is all about politics, and so that everyone who comes to the floor of this House can vote for this House Budget Committee reported budget with the pride of knowing it was put together with integrity about a vision for a better future. Again, we are going to have six other competing visions, Mr. Speaker. I can only hope that those numbers, those charts, those graphs were put together with the same care and integrity that Chairman RYAN used in the Budget Committee.

For folks who are trying to make up their minds about where they're going to cast their votes today, again I urge the strong support of this open rule that allows for the complete debate over all of these alternatives; but I also encourage my colleagues to give a look at that work product that we created on the House Budget Committee, a work product that I believe, Mr. Speaker, is crafted in a way that can make every Member of this body proud.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 4271, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA.

This is a vital law that I coauthored with Pat Schroeder in 1994 and of which I have been an original cosponsor each time it has been reauthorized. Since VAWA's enactment in 1994, the cases of domestic violence have fallen, and over 1 million women have used the justice system to obtain protective orders against their batterers.

To discuss this proposal, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Representative SLAUGHTER.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to allow us to consider the Violence Against Women Act. It is pathetic and it is disappointing that it has come to this—that we have to use procedural shenanigans to talk about an initiative that has been a bipartisan initiative since 1994.

Violence against women in this country is not levied against just Democrats but Republicans as well; not blacks or whites or Hispanics but against Native American people as well; not just Christians or Muslims but Jews and nonreligious people—atheists—as well; not just rich people or poor people but middle class people as well; and not just against heterosexual women but homosexual couples as well. It knows no gender. It knows no ethnicity. It knows nothing.

I'll tell you that violence against women is as American as apple pie. I know not only as a legislator but from my own personal experience that domestic violence has been a thread throughout my personal life, from being a child who was repeatedly sexually assaulted up to and including being an adult who has been raped. I just don't have enough time to share all of those experiences with you.

Yet I can tell you, when this bill came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee with all of the Republican Senators—all of the guys—voting no, it really brought up some terrible memories for me of having boys sit in a locker room and sort of bet that I, the A kid, couldn't be had and then having the appointed boy, when he saw that I wasn't going to be so willing, complete a date rape and then take my underwear to display it to the rest of the boys. I mean, this is what American women are facing.

I am so proud to be an author of this amendment because it has been, in the past, a bipartisan bill. This bill will strengthen the core programs and support law enforcement, prosecutions, and judicial staff training. It will include new initiatives aimed at preventing domestic violence-related homicides that occur every single day in this country. It will extend the authority to protect Native American victims on tribal lands. It will ensure a strong response to the insufficient reporting and services for victims of sexual assault. It will increase the numbers of U visas for undocumented women who, because they're in the shadows, are particularly vulnerable to domestic violence. This bill will also expand services for those in underserved communities, who, due to their religion or gender or sexual orientation, have not been served.

This is not a partisan issue, and it would be very, very devastating to women of all colors, creeds, and sexual orientations for us not to address this.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague from Wisconsin that her words are always among some of the most powerful that we have on the Budget Committee, and I don't believe I've ever heard her speak from a place that was not of conviction. I want to say I appreciate those words, and you have my support on the Rules Committee. If we can get that bill reported out of Judiciary, I would love to see that in the Rules Committee and would love to see us report that to the House floor for that same kind of free and open debate that we are having today on the Budget Committee, and I appreciate the words that you shared.

I must say, though, Mr. Speaker, I have a tough time connecting the Violence Against Women Act with these budgets. I will disagree with my colleague from Wisconsin and will encourage folks to support the previous question so that we can have this budget debate. Should we have the debate that my colleague is discussing? I believe we absolutely should. Again, I know the committees of jurisdiction are working on that, and my hope is that they will report that and send that to the Rules Committee.

□ 1330

But today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity. It's not an unprecedented opportunity, but it's one of the rarest of opportunities that we have here in the House, which is to have a debate on the floor that includes every single idea that any of our 435 Members have offered as a vision of how to govern this land, of how to set our fiscal priorities, of this morality that is deciding how to spend taxpayer dollars. We must seize that opportunity today. It's one that comes but once a year, Mr. Speaker; an opportunity but once a year to set these priorities. And again, the Rules Committee has provided time not just today but tomorrow as well to make sure we can thoroughly flesh out each and every one of these ideas and make sure that no one's voice on the floor of this House is silenced.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me take about 30 seconds just to say that I appreciate what my colleague from Georgia is saying. However, we are not giving a choice whether we are going to do the budget or violence against women, but we're going to have an attempt to do both on the rule.

What we can do in the vote for the budget—when we vote for the rule, we would like to have the previous question be defeated so that we can add VAWA to it. That's all we are trying to do here today.

The bill is about to expire. It would be a dreadful thing to think that women and children and the other spouse would be growing up with violence because we have failed to provide the resources to stop that, after it has been so successful since 1994.

Now I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for the consistent leadership she has given to this important legislation since it was passed. It took us a number of years to get it passed in the first place, and it's never been off her radar screen.

I especially want to thank my good friend from Wisconsin, who has come forward in a very compelling way to ask that we vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can consider the Violence Against Women Act, which may well expire, making it—I fear—a real target for the Appropriations Committee because the law will not have been reauthorized.

Mr. Speaker, I visited a safe house last week in my district because I wanted to hear why a woman would make the decision to stay at home with an abuser rather than leave. I'm not sure I understood in my heart why she would assume the risk rather than leave. I'm glad I went. There were eight women there, different ages. Some had children. For the first time, when I heard the stories of these women, I understood in the most poignant and practical way what a ''hotline'' actually means, what a ''rape crisis center'' means. After that experience, the notion that when this legislation expires, the Appropriations Committee would have before it unauthorized appropriations, which become a target in and of itself, was just too much to bear. Yet the reauthorization bill has gone nowhere here. At least in the other body, the bill has been passed out of committee. It is a bipartisan bill, with several Republicans as well as Democrats on it.

Ms. MOORE's amendment essentially does no more than incorporate the Senate bill, which is tailor-made for our consideration, because in keeping with the way in which reductions are taking place—20 percent is very painful—but there is a 20 percent reduction in the reauthorized act, even though with any reauthorization you would expect an increase. Yet even with that reduction, we cannot get the bill on this floor. So we must do what we're doing this afternoon.

If you want to talk about a bill that is worth the money, there are very few bills where we can show the kind of cause-and-effect that we can show here. There has been a 50 percent drop annually in domestic violence. And the reason for that is there's been over a 50 percent increase in reporting. Women are not afraid to come out because they know that if they report it, go to the police station, the police will tell them where there is a safe house.

Don't leave women out on the streets. Don't leave their children with no place to go. Vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to allow the House to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, which I think would receive bipartisan support if it were heard this afternoon.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I was expecting one additional speaker, but I believe she is not here. So I am prepared to close.

Let me say, Mr. WOODALL is a generous and kind man, and I know he understands what we are talking about here today.

My speaker is here, so let me yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlelady.

In 21st century America, three women die every day at the hands of their husbands, boyfriends, or former partners. Domestic violence causes 2 million injuries a year. Sadly, it is something that one out of every four women will experience in their lifetimes.

This is particularly a difficult problem for young women today. Women between the ages of 16 and 24 have the highest rates of relationship violence, and one in every five women will be sexually assaulted while they are in college. Even more worrisome, we know that when couples are experiencing economic difficulties, domestic violence is three times as likely to occur.

Victim service providers have seen an increase in demand since the recession began while also seeing their funding cut. More than 70 percent of shelters credited ''financial issues'' for increases in abuse that they have seen in communities across the country.

In 1994, our now-Vice President JOE BIDEN wrote and championed the Violence Against Women Act. In 17 years it has cut the rate of domestic violence in our country by over half. It is past time to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act again, and my colleague's amendment would allow us to act now. This bill reauthorizes the programs that have been proven to work to stem domestic violence and to help law enforcement and prosecutors do their jobs.

This reauthorization enjoys bipartisan support in the United States Senate, with 59 cosponsors. In addition, over 200 national organizations and 500 State and local organizations have urged us to pass this bill, including the National Association of Attorneys General, National District Attorneys Association, National Sheriffs' Association, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. Why do they want us to do this? Because it helps to make their jobs easier, and it gives women the tools to be able to protect themselves.

Everyone, everyone in this Chamber wants to see an America where no woman ever has to endure the scourge of domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act is helping us realize this vision. We must reauthorize the law so it can continue to help our constituents.

And I am also proud to tell you that the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform legislation, now says that if a woman is a victim of domestic violence, her insurance company can no longer say that that is a preexisting condition, and she can get the kind of health care coverage that she needs. That's the value of reauthorizing this legislation and the value of the Affordable Care Act.

I urge you to support this amendment so we can act now. Let's move forward. Reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act once again.

Mr. WOODALL. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, Ms. DELAURO has just reminded me that when we began the debate on health care, that eight States in the United States and the District of Columbia considered violence against women to be a preexisting condition, and a woman who had been beaten to a pulp could not be insured because she would be apt to have that happen to her again. And we changed that in that bill.

□ 1340

I think all of us, too, are familiar with the phrase ''rule of thumb,'' but I'm not sure a lot of us understand what it means. The rule of thumb was the size of a man's thumb and the stick with which he could legally beat his wife. So every time you use that, I want you to remember what that means.

Since VAWA's enactment, we've all seen that domestic violence has fallen over half. Policemen have been trained and the courts have been trained to understand it better.

There was a time in the United States when it was simply considered a private manner and police would not always take away the offending partner, leaving a person again to be beaten one more time.

I don't think anybody in the House of Representatives wants this to expire. I'm sure they don't. Everybody has mothers, sisters, daughters, and nieces that they want to protect.

This is such a simple thing. It doesn't hurt the budget at all. We have tried our best to get this bill brought up in the House; and we're terrified, frankly, those of us who have spent a good bit of our time in Congress trying to deal with this act, that it will expire. As I've pointed out many times, I've been at this since 1994.

It's such a serious thing, that shelters for battered women are never revealed as to their location because of fear that the offending spouse will find them and make them come home or other things.

This past 5 or 6 years, we've seen a number of spouses being killed; and we always look at what goes on in those houses, and nobody ever realized before what was happening there. More women obviously need to know that there is someplace that they can go and someplace that they can get help.

Let me give you a figure because we're pretty much concerned here about the deficit, the budget, and costs.

In studies recently released, they have shown that just a 2-minute screening of domestic violence victims in a yearly checkup can save nearly $6 billion in chronic health care costs every year. The screenings are provided for in the Violence Against Women Act, which trains health care professionals to recognize and address the signs of domestic violence, because obviously most women who are trying to cover it up simply attempt to live with it and are not going to bring it up themselves.

Approximately 2 million women are physically or sexually assaulted or stalked by an intimate partner every single year; one out of every six women has experienced an attempted or completed rape at some point in her lifetime; one in four women in the U.S. will experience domestic violence in her lifetime. This is terrible.

The Congress has a responsibility to ensure that rape prevention programs are fully funded, that law enforcement has the resources, that battered women's shelters are open, and that victim advocates have the training to stop the violence against women.

With all this authorization expiring before this year's end, we're in danger of letting these responsibilities go unfulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to please vote ''no'' on the previous question for all of those women who live in fear and for all those children who witness that violence. Violence against women changes people's lives forever, mentally and physically. They will never, ever be the same. For heaven's sake, let's reauthorize this bill. It does so much for them.

I urge everyone in the House to please vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we continue to provide support to the millions of women who are victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the comments of my friend from New York. We serve together on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and we grapple with tough issues on the Rules Committee every single time we meet. There's no easy day on the Rules Committee. Every bill is a challenge because of the different ideas that folks have to make it better. But what I've learned in that time, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm not the smartest guy in the room, I'm not the smartest guy in this Congress, and I'm not the smartest guy in my district.

There's a reason we have regular order here in the U.S. House of Representatives, so that even a good idea we can make better.

I have some folks come to me in my district and they say, ROB, why is it that you put that hospital funding that we need in the transportation bill? Those things don't have anything to do with one another. Why do you combine those two things? If it's a good idea to pass the transportation bill, let's pass the transportation bill; and if it's a good idea to pass the hospital bill, let's pass the hospital bill. But why do you put these disconnected things together? Why do you try to fund a new military procurement program in the environmental and National Park funding? Why do you stick those things together, ROB? They don't have anything to do with one another.

I actually campaigned on that issue, Mr. Speaker, because I think they're right. I think that the American people deserve an up-or-down vote on one issue at a time. I think my colleague from New York, my colleague from Connecticut, my colleague from the District of Columbia, and my colleague from Wisconsin make extremely compelling cases for why we should see the Violence Against Women Act come through regular order.

But my understanding is—and I would be happy to be corrected if I'm mistaken—my understanding is the bill was just introduced yesterday, that it hasn't had an opportunity to go through those committees where folks know so much more about these issues than we do in the Rules Committee or in the Budget Committee; that it has not had an opportunity to be amended and improved, to have the opportunity for those Members for whom this is a heartfelt and compelling issue to put in their two cents to make it even better.

I think it should have that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I encourage folks to vote ''yes'' on the previous question so that we can move forward to debate these budgets today, and then I urge my colleagues—let me say it, Mr. Speaker, because I know folks are watching this on the screens back in their rooms—the bill number of the Violence Against Women Act is H.R. 4271, Mr. Speaker. There's no question—because this is a House where folks believe in regular order—that the more cosponsors a bill accumulates and the faster it accumulates them, the more likely it is to end up on this floor in haste, rapidly, immediately in order to have a hearing.

I would encourage my colleagues to go and look at that bill again just dropped yesterday, but certainly something that I know this House and the Judiciary Committee and others are going to want to consider.

The opportunity we have today, though, Mr. Speaker, with this rule, is to define our national vision. I don't mean our vision for just the Nation, our land, Mr. Speaker. I mean a vision for us as a people. Who are we as a people, Mr. Speaker?

I heard one of the Presidential candidates speak the other day and he said, This year we don't need politicians that we can believe in; we need politicians who believe in us.

I thought that was pretty profound. I don't need somebody I can believe in. I need somebody who believes in me. That's true, Mr. Speaker.

We lay out all of these different competing budget visions here, the summaries of which I hold in my hand. My question to my colleagues is: Which of these visions do you believe believes in you? Which of these visions lays out that future of America that is best for you and your family, that is best for your constituents and their families, that is best for your State, that is best for our Nation?

The visions are starkly different, Mr. Speaker. Again, the base bill is the bill that we reported out of the Budget Committee. That is the base text. These are substitutes for that.

For example, we have a bipartisan substitute—Republican and Democratic Members of the House—that raises taxes by $2 trillion more. To be perfectly accurate, it's $1.8 trillion more than the Republican budget that the committee passed. It spends $3.1 trillion more. It focuses on different priorities. The debt increases by about $1.4 trillion. That's the cost of those priorities. Again, some priorities may be worth that cost. We'll have that debate on the floor.

The ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, his budget substitute also raises taxes by $1.8 trillion over the next 10 years more than the House Budget Committee budget does and spends $4.7 trillion more than the House Budget Committee budget does and thus adds $2.9 trillion more to the backs of our children.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, about $15.5 trillion today, soon to be $16 trillion, that we've borrowed and spent, that we've impoverished our children with so that we can live today at the standard of living that we have, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Maryland's substitute increases that by $3 trillion more than does the House Budget Committee report.

Do the priorities that he spends on merit that kind of increase? Do the priorities that he focuses on merit that kind of debt increase? Perhaps they do. We're going to have that debate on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1350

The Congressional Black Caucus substitute raises taxes by $6 trillion over 10 years, more than the House budget bill does, and it spends $5.3 trillion more, which means the Congressional Black Caucus substitute actually reduces the national debt more than the House Budget Committee does. Now, it does so by raising taxes $6 trillion, and it only reduces the debt by under $1 trillion, but that's one of those priorities that folks have had the courage to lay out here on the floor of the House that we're going to make in order.

My colleague from New York, the chairman from California, this Budget Committee of men and women, Mr. Speaker, has made every single option available.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker, their proposal is to raise taxes by $6.8 trillion more than the Republican Budget Committee budget, the budget that was passed out of the entire Budget Committee. It increases spending by about $6.6 trillion, one of the highest spending of the bunch, again, focusing on priorities that all 435 Members of this House deserve an opportunity to hear and an opportunity to consider.

We have an opportunity in this House, Mr. Speaker, to do great things. We have an opportunity in this House to stand up for the priorities that are the priorities of our constituents back home. And we don't have to vote on 100 different ideas in one bill, Mr. Speaker. In the 15 months I've been here, Mr. Speaker, all but about five of the bills have been short enough for me to read; I don't have to staff it out, and I don't have to have a team of speed readers out there working through it. All but about five have been short enough for me to read.

That's a source of great pride for me on the Rules Committee, because I've told folks back home and folks believe it back home that we ought to have time to carefully deliberate each and every thing. Folks are tired of 1,500-page bills. Folks are tired of 2,500-page bills. Folks are tired of the defense bill being merged with the transportation bill which is merged with the health care bill which is merged with the national parks bill which also funds the White House. That's crazy, and it doesn't have to be that way. There's not one rule of this House that requires that nonsense to go on. In fact, the opposite is true. The rules of the House were actually created to prevent that from going on, and we have to work really hard to pervert the process in a way that makes that possible.

This Speaker has made an effort unlike any I've ever seen to try to have one idea at a time down here on the floor of the House, one idea at a time so that the American people's voice can be heard. If we bring a bill to the floor, Mr. Speaker, that supports dogcatchers on the one hand and hospital funding on the other and somebody votes ''no,'' what are they voting ''no'' on? Are they voting ''no'' on the dogcatchers or are they voting ''no'' on the hospital? You can't tell. And that's what happens. Have you seen that?

Have you ever wondered why it is, Mr. Speaker, that in our appropriations process the food stamp language and the agricultural subsidy language is in the same appropriations bill? I always wondered. I started thinking about it as I watched the votes going on the board, and what I figured out is that we don't have enough farmers in this country for everybody to vote to increase farm spending, and we don't have enough folks with high food stamp populations in their district to support having high food stamp spending, but when you combine those two groups together, guess what? You get 51 percent of this House and you can make things happen.

Well, I guess I support the ingenuity of folks who find ways to cobble a multitude of ideas together and find 51 percent, but I ask my colleagues, is that really what our constituents sent us here to do? Is cobbling together multiple ideas and just trying to game the system enough to find your 51 percent, Mr. Speaker, is that really what our Framers intended? Or, alternatively, should we commit ourselves to not just having an open process, Mr. Speaker, but an open process on a single idea?

Do you know what I found on the Rules Committee? And it was a surprise to me—and if you haven't had a chance to serve on the Rules Committee, it might not be intuitive to you—but when you bring a small bill to the Rules Committee, when you focus on one single idea, when you find one priority that you want to make the law of the land and you send that to the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, then the amendment process is only open to amendments that are germane to that underlying idea. If you bring a bill about hospital funding to the Rules Committee, well, then, the only germane amendments that will be considered are amendments that have to do with hospital funding.

So the shorter we make these bills and the more single-minded we make these bills, the more open we can have the process here on the House floor. Mr. Speaker, this freshman class is full of a bunch of CEOs from the private sector, folks who ran for Congress because they're worried about the direction of this country, and they said, Dadgumit, I've got to step up; I've got to run, and I've got to be a part of the solution. And they get here thinking that they were going to be able to do it all overnight. It turns out there are 435 of us, and we all have the same voting card. It's harder. Nobody is king of the world in here. It's one man, one woman, one vote, and there are 435 of us. You've got to find that agreement.

Well, it turns out there really is a lot of agreement, not just agreement on the Republican side of the aisle, not just agreement on the Democratic side of the aisle, but agreement across this whole House when we open up the process and allow the House to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we have here today. We have a rule that opens up the process, that flings open the doors of democracy and lets every single idea be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage an affirmative vote on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 597 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4271) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 597, if ordered; suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 1339; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Benishek
Filner
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Miller, George
Paul
Rangel
Roe (TN)
Shimkus
Stearns

□ 1426

Messrs. ALTMIRE, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. OLVER and CARNAHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. BLACK and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

ON THE RETIREMENT OF HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN JOHN V. SULLIVAN

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

Mr. BOEHNER. It's my privilege today to pay tribute to John Sullivan, who will retire this week after 8 years of service as our Parliamentarian and 25 years of service to this House.

John leaves his post with much to be proud of, starting with a first-rate team of parliamentarians who will do a fine job carrying on his legacy.

The parls are the people who are here first every morning, and they're also the last ones to leave at night. They review every piece of legislation. They keep us tethered to the rules and traditions that are the House's foundation. In this way, the parliamentarians are really the glue that holds this House together.

The leader of that team is John Sullivan, whose devotion to the House is as total as his commitment to Indiana basketball. Now, Coach Bobby Knight once defined ''discipline'' as ''doing what you have to do, doing it as well as you possibly can, and doing it that way all the time.'' By this definition, John truly is one of the most disciplined people to have ever served in this House.

He consistently has shown grace under pressure in what well may be one of the biggest pressure cookers on Earth. He has strengthened and modernized the Office of the Parliamentarian to meet the needs of a more open and transparent Congress.

John, who was here on 9/11, determined how the House should go forward, and has spent every day preparing for the unexpected. In a body where anything can happen, he's always thinking two steps ahead, like any good coach.

So, of course, John's a modest man. He would just say it was just him doing his job. Like I said, discipline. But make no mistake: for the House and the people that we serve, he's gone above and beyond the call of duty.

John, we're sorry to see you go, but we want to wish you and your family the best. On behalf of the whole House, we want to thank you for your service.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the Speaker for yielding. I am proud to join him to honor the long and distinguished service of the House Parliamentarian, John Sullivan.

For 25 years, as has been said, he has served the House with distinction and dignity, integrity and intellect. He has used his keen mind, excellent legal training, and a commitment to public service to make nonpartisan, objective decisions. Always first in his mind was the Constitution and, therefore, his undying respect for the institution of Congress. Indeed, through his service and his example, John Sullivan has become an institution himself, a source of wise counsel and parliamentary leadership, and though his name rarely makes headlines and though his hard work is seldom noticed in the public eye, the American people have benefited greatly from his extraordinary career.

A proud son of northwest Indiana, John Sullivan was a lawyer by training, a graduate of the Air Force Academy, and served our Nation in the Judge Advocate General's Office of the Air Force. He went on to advise the House Armed Services Committee before joining the Parliamentarian's office. He would ultimately hold the title of Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, a post occupied by only three others in the past 75 years. He has been a fair and independent voice, a professional of the highest caliber, a careful steward of the rules of the House, a true public servant.

Mr. Speaker, as a point of personal pride, on June 2, 1987, I was sworn in as a result of a special election, and I was the first Member of Congress to take the oath of office during John's tenure. For many reasons, he will hold a long place of honor in the history of the House, and in my personal history as well.

In a recent story on his career, John Sullivan summed up the key characteristics of his success. In his own words, he said, ''You have to be very attentive to every syllable being uttered and able to think on your feet,'' as the Speaker said.

Attention to detail, quick thinking, staying attuned to the letter of the law, these were the hallmarks of John Sullivan's service. He has left a lasting legacy, and I am confident that his deputy and replacement, Tom Wickham, will continue in the same fine tradition.

We owe a debt of gratitude to all of our Parliamentarians. We owe a special debt of gratitude and our heartfelt thanks on this day to our Parliamentarian, John Sullivan. He has earned the respect and the admiration of Members of Congress, and he will be missed. We wish him and his wife, Nancy, and his children our best wishes for their future endeavors.

Congratulations and thank you, John Sullivan.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—184

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra

Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel

□ 1441

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 140, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1339) to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 6, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—413

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—6

Amash
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Hurt
McKinley
Wolf

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—4

Benishek
Forbes
Rooney
Wittman

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Sullivan

□ 1449

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 141, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 111, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—300

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—111

Adams
Andrews
Baldwin
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Cummings
DeFazio
Dent
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Landry
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lynch
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Nugent
Olver
Pallone
Paulsen
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rooney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schilling
Shuler
Slaughter
Stark
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—4

Amash
Cardoza
Gingrey (GA)
Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Bass (CA)
Capito
Cleaver
Davis (KY)
Dreier
Fattah
Filner
Gohmert
Hastings (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Van Hollen

□ 1456

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 142, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 112.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 597 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1455

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 consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mr. KLINE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

I look forward to working with my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member, on what's going to be a long day and a great debate. Let me start this debate, first off, by saying this is what our constituents sent us here to do: to lead, to make decisions, to budget.

I want to start off by saying to the gentleman from Maryland how much I appreciate the adherence to the longstanding protocol in the Budget Committee on how, while we clearly disagree on a lot of the big fundamental issues, we've been able to conduct this debate in a civil manner. And I'm pleased that that tradition from the Budget Committee is continuing to this day, and I want to simply say how grateful I am for that.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we passed the boldest budget in recent history, a comprehensive plan to lift the debt and free the Nation from the constraints of an ever-expanding Federal Government. We changed the debate in Washington. Suddenly we're having a debate about how much spending we should cut instead of how much more to spend, how to create jobs the right way, by getting the Federal Government off our backs, by eliminating the debt, and by reforming the Tax Code so that American families and small businesses can create a true economic recovery.

This week, we're prepared to be right here on the floor to take it one step further. We're bringing a 2013 budget, which we call the Path to Prosperity, which does this: it cuts $5.3 trillion in spending from the President's budget. It clears the roadblock of the partisan health care law that is now being debated in the Supreme Court because we believe that this partisan health care law is a roadblock to bipartisan reform. It puts our budget on the path to balance and a path to completely pay off our debt.

By contrast, look at what other leaders are doing today. The President sent us a budget last month, the fourth budget in a row, which proposes to do nothing to pay off the debt, let alone ever get the budget in balance. The President gave us a budget with the fourth trillion-dollar deficit in a row, ignoring the drivers of our debt, doing what his budget says, ''advancing the deterioration of our fiscal situation.''

The President's Treasury Secretary came to the Budget Committee and said:

> We are not saying we have a solution to the long-term problem. We're just saying that we don't like yours.

Well, I couldn't have said it better myself.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, by offering empty promises instead of real solutions, the President and his party leaders have made their choice clear. They're choosing the next election over the next generation. Our government, in both political parties, have made decades of empty promises to Americans, and soon those empty promises are going to become broken promises unless we reform government. We're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. It can't keep continuing.

We're offering Americans a better choice. We're offering Americans solutions. And let me just quickly walk you through just the kind of situation America faces today. This is what the Congressional Budget Office tells us we're looking at—a crushing burden of debt that is not only going to affect our children's generation by denying them a better standard of living, a prosperous future, but it's going to put our own economy into a tailspin. All the experts came to the Budget Committee and told us we don't have much time left to avert this tidal wave of debt.

Now, what's the rush? Why do we need to move so quickly? Because, Mr. Chairman, every year we don't do something to fix this debt crisis, we go that much deeper into the hole. That many more trillions of dollars of empty promises are being made to the American people.

Back in 2009, we asked the General Accountability Office how many empty promises is our government making to today's Americans? In 2009 they said, $62.9 trillion. Then we said in 2010, how many empty promises now? Now it's $76.4 trillion. Today, just 1 year later, they're now saying last year's stack of empty promises to Americans was $99.6 trillion. It's impossible to get your mind around these numbers.

What does that mean? That means if we want our government to keep all of the promises it is now making to current Americans—my mom's generation, my generation, and my children's generation—we have to, all of a sudden, invent, create and come up with about $100 trillion today and invest it at Treasury rates just so we could have the money to keep these promises government is making. That's impossible. It can't be done. We know that.

So it's time to stop lying to the American people. It's time to be honest about the situation we're in and then start fixing the problem because every year we go over $10 trillion deeper in the hole. Every year we go that much closer toward a debt crisis where government reneges on its promise to Americans. The people who need government the most—the poor, the sick and the elderly—they're the ones who get hurt first and the worst in a debt crisis.

What is the primary driver of this crisis? Spending. What the Congressional Budget Office tells us is spending is on course to double by the time my kids are my age and then double again over the course of this century. Revenues are going back to where they historically have been, but spending is on an unsustainable trajectory. And when you have to borrow that much money, when you have to borrow 40 cents on the dollar, just look at where it's coming from. This is not the 1970s where our debt was relatively pretty small and we borrowed about 5 cents on the dollar from foreign countries; and it's not the 1990s where our debt was getting big, and we borrowed at 19 cents from foreign governments.

Today, in 2012, 46 percent of our borrowing in this country—borrowing that's bigger than our economy now—comes from other nations, China being number one. We can't keep relying on other governments to cash flow our government. We are ceding our sovereignty and our ability to control our own destiny as a country when we have to hope that other countries will lend us money. We've got to get this under control.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, here's what this budget does in a nutshell. It says, Let's get ahead of this problem. Let's preempt a debt crisis, and let's do it in a way so we can do it in a gradual way. Let's do it in a way so that we can preempt and prevent a debt crisis on our own terms as Americans. Let's not wait until we have a crisis. Let's not wait until interest rates go up and we're in sort of a European meltdown mode. Let's do it right, and do it now, because then we can keep the promises that government has made to people who need it the most—people who are already retired, people who are about to retire, the people who rely on government. You have to reform government to do that.

Instead of this mountain of debt, the Path to Prosperity budget puts our deficit and our debt on a downward slope and pays off the debt entirely over time. That takes time, that takes will, and it begins now. In short, Mr. Chairman, if we don't tackle these fiscal problems soon, they're going to tackle us as a country.

The best way to do it is put the kinds of ideas and reforms in place that grow the economy, create jobs, and get us back on a path to prosperity. We believe in the Founders' vision of the American idea. Your rights come from God and nature, not from government; and we believe in the freedom to pursue happiness. That means we want prosperity, we want upward mobility, and we want freedom and opportunity. Freedom and opportunity are gone if we have a debt crisis.

So what we're saying is let's do everything we can to get this economy growing, to get people back to work and back on their feet, and let's get our spending under control. Let's get our borrowing under control, and let's reform those government programs that are the primary drivers of our debt so that we can fulfill that great legacy that all of our parents told us about when we were growing up in this country, and that is this: each generation in America makes the next generation better off.

We know without a shred of doubt, it's irrefutable, that we're in the midst of giving the next generation a worse-off country, a lower standard of living and a diminished future. We have a moral and a legal obligation to stop that from happening, to pass a budget, to prevent that, to get us back on prosperity and get our debt paid off; and that's precisely what this budget does.

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

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

Let me start by thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee for the way he's conducted the proceedings in the committee, and I look forward to a debate on the floor because as the chairman said, we have very deep differences. We do not have a difference on the question of whether or not we should reduce the deficits and the debt. Of course we do. We have a difference over how to do that.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican plan and in support of the Democratic alternative. The Republican budget on the floor of the House today is simply the sequel to last year's plan—more of the same. It abandons the economic recovery and ends the Medicare guarantee for individuals whose median income is under $21,000 while providing a whopping average tax break of almost $400,000 for people making over $1 million a year. These tax breaks for the very wealthy and the tax breaks for special interests come at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, at the expense of seniors, and at the expense of essential investments to keep America strong.

This Republican plan will weaken economic growth and, according to independent analysts, result in over 2 million jobs lost over the next 2 years. It rewards corporations that ship American jobs overseas while slashing investments in education, in scientific research and infrastructure that help America grow our economy right here at home. In short, it is a path to greater prosperity if you are already wealthy, while leaving seniors, working Americans, and future generations behind.

Mr. Chairman, we gather here at a very important time for our country. As a result of the extraordinary actions taken over the last 4 years and the tenacity of the American people and small businesses, America avoided a second Great Depression, and the economy is slowly recovering. Still, millions of Americans remain out of work through no fault of their own. We must push forward with the recovery, not fall back; and we certainly should not return to the failed economic policies that got America into this economic mess to begin with.

And yet that is exactly what this Republican budget does.

□ 1510

It is a recipe for national stagnation and decline. It retreats from our national goal of out-educating, out-building and out-competing the rest of the world. And it will weaken the economic recovery by slashing investments to important economic growth and expanding those tax breaks that reward corporations that ship American jobs overseas. Even when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry, it cuts critical investments in our transportation systems, including a 46 percent cut in transportation starting next year.

As I mentioned earlier, nonpartisan analysts looked at this and concluded it would lose 2 million jobs over 2 years. So, rather than putting the economy into reverse, we need to move forward. We need to adopt the remainder of the President's jobs plan, a plan that's been sitting here in the House since September.

It's also clear that putting America back to work is the fastest and most effective way to reduce deficits in the short term. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that our weak economy and underemployment is the single major contributing factor to the deficit this year, accounting for over one-third of the projected 2012 deficit. So we need to come up with a credible plan.

The issue, as I said, is not whether but how. Every bipartisan group that has looked at ways to reduce the deficit in a credible way has recommended a balanced approach, meaning a combination of spending cuts and cuts to tax breaks for the wealthy, and the elimination of special interest corporate tax loopholes.

The Democratic alternative provides that balanced approach, while the Republican plan, unfortunately, fails that test. Instead, their plan would again rig the rules in favor of the very wealthy and special interests. That may not be a surprise, since virtually every House Republican has signed a pledge—a pledge—to Grover Norquist saying they will not close a single special interest tax loophole, not eliminate a single oil subsidy for the purpose of deficit reduction, not one penny.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we face a real deficit and debt problem. Apparently, the problem is not big enough to ask folks at the very high end of the income scale to contribute one penny toward deficit reduction.

In addition to locking in those parts of the Bush tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the very wealthy, they now have a new round of tax cuts that will provide, on average, a $400,000 tax cut for people making over $1 million a year. That's according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center.

So, here's the key: because our Republican colleagues refuse to ask millionaires to contribute 1 cent to deficit reduction, they hit everyone and everything else.

Let's take a look at Medicare recipients. They immediately increase costs to seniors for Medicare preventive services and terminate a new service, the wellness programs, that were part of the Affordable Care Act. They immediately reduce support to seniors in the prescription drug plan by reopening the doughnut hole. That decision will cost seniors with high drug costs an average of $10,000 over the next 10 years.

Once again, this Republican budget does not reform Medicare; it deforms it. It proposes to end the Medicare guarantee, shifting rising costs onto seniors and disabled individuals. It gives you the equivalent of a voucher, but if your voucher amount is not sufficient to pay for the rising cost of health care, too bad. Too bad. It simply rations your health care and choice of doctor by income and leaves seniors to the whims of the insurance industry.

Despite claims that market competition is going to bring down those rising costs, the plan creates that artificial cap on the voucher support. Our Republican colleagues say they're using the part D prescription drug plan as a model, but that has no artificial cap. They say it's the same kind of plan offered to Members of Congress under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, but that has no cap on support from their plans. So, unlike Members of Congress, seniors in Medicare will get vouchers with declining purchasing power relative to rising health care costs.

In fact, if you look at this chart, Mr. Chairman, you will see what the current Medicare plan would provide in terms of the amount of support provided by the plan to the individual on health care. That's the blue line. This is the green line, Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, the plan that Members of Congress are on. As you can see, the amount of the premium support keeps pace with rising health care costs. This red line is the Republican voucher plan that caps the amount an individual can receive and goes steadily downward, giving seniors on Medicare a worse deal than Members of Congress would give to themselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this budget also rips apart the safety net for seniors in nursing homes and assisted living facilities, as well as low-income kids and individuals with disabilities who rely on Medicaid. Remember, two-thirds of Medicaid funding goes to seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals, yet that is one of the biggest areas of the Republican budget cuts. It takes a hatchet to Medicaid, slashing over $800 billion and cutting Medicaid by one-third by the year 2022. This is done under the Orwellian title in their plan of ''repairing'' the social safety net. That's like throwing an anchor to a drowning person.

Mr. Chairman, to govern is to choose, and that's what this debate is all about. The choices in this Republican budget are simply wrong for America. It is not bold to provide tax breaks to millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking them with the bill for rising health care costs. It's not courageous to protect tax giveaways to Big Oil companies and other special interests while slashing investments in our kids' education, scientific research, and critical infrastructure. It is not visionary to reward corporations that ship American jobs overseas while terminating affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans. It is certainly not brave to cut support for seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and poor kids. And it is not fair to raise taxes on middle-income

Americans financed by another round of tax breaks for the very wealthy. Yet those are the choices made in this Republican budget.

Where is the shared responsibility?

Mr. Chairman, we can and we must do better. Let's reject this budget and adopt the Democratic alternative which provides a balanced approach to accomplishing the goal of reducing our deficits while at the same time strengthening our economy and doing it in a way that calls for shared responsibility.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his vision and courage. It has truly been an honor to serve on the committee under his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, the House passed a budget that would have put our Nation back on the path to fiscal solvency and ultimately paid off the entire national debt. It would have saved Medicare and Medicaid from collapse and put them back on a solid and secure foundation. According to Standard & Poor's, it would have preserved the AAA credit rating of the United States Government. That plan was killed in the Senate, which has not passed a budget in 3 years.

The Senate majority leader complained that it threatened the Cowboy Poetry Festival in Elko, Nevada. An allied group ran a smear campaign depicting Congressman RYAN as a monster willing to throw his grandmother off a cliff. Sadly, that's what passes for reasoned discourse from today's left.

The result is that today our country is another year older and more than $1 trillion deeper in debt. We've lost our AAA credit rating. We've watched our Nation's debt exceed our entire economy, putting us in the same league as the worst-run European governments.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect budget, no budget ever is, but it will save our country from the calamity that is now destroying Greece. That should be reason enough for adopting it with a resounding and, dare I hope, bipartisan vote.

A year ago, a panel of experts from left to right warned us that we were, at best, 5 years from a sovereign debt crisis. I wonder how many more years we've got. How many more chances will we have to set things right before events overtake us and we enter the inexorable downward spiral of bankrupt nations?

Let's not find out the answer to that question. Let us act now to redeem our Nation's finances and restore our Nation's freedom while there is still time. That is our generation's responsibility. That is our generation's destiny.

□ 1520

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN for yielding the time and stand to say that jobs need to be America's number one priority. The Republican budget shows, once again, that Republicans don't have a jobs agenda. You balance family and national budgets by creating jobs and putting people back to work.

We still have over 12 million Americans looking for work, and that doesn't even include those who have fallen off benefits or are looking for work but can't find full-time employment.

I said when we marked up this bill in committee, and I will say it again, this Republican budget completely ignores the President's jobs agenda. Instead, Republicans, incredibly, criticized Democrats for taking the steps that helped save the U.S. auto industry and millions of related high-paying manufacturing jobs.

Republicans opposed the payroll tax extension for middle class Americans, which will help keep demand up so that businesses can hire more workers. Republicans are pushing for irresponsible cuts that economists have warned will hurt the economy and job creation, and Republicans proposed a partisan transportation bill that would bankrupt the highway trust fund and destroy thousands of jobs.

In committee, we couldn't even get the Republicans to support a modest Veterans Jobs Corps to create 20,000 jobs for our vets returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. I raised this situation with President Obama during one of his Ohio visits and shared with him H.R. 494, a bill I've drafted, and the President saw a need to create jobs, and his administration asked Congress to do this for our returning vets.

The Republican majority has said no to our veterans as thousands and thousands of them return and remain unemployed.

I ask my colleagues to reject the Republican budget, support the Democratic alternative, and put our economy first. Job creation for all Americans must be our top priority and is the first step in beginning to balance our budget which requires a growth economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. MICA, for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. I thank the chair of the Budget Committee. And first, let me commend Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

I'm pleased with the cooperative working relationship between our two committees, particularly as we seek to move a multiyear surface transportation reauthorization to the floor in the near future.

As you know, H.R. 7 is the most significant transportation reform bill since the Interstate Highway System was created some 50 years ago. The bill will reduce the Federal bureaucracy by consolidating or eliminating more than 70 programs and allows States to set their own transportation priorities, not bureaucrats here in Washington.

H.R. 7 provides the stable and predictable funding stream that is necessary for States and construction companies to take on major construction projects that span several years. The bill accomplishes more with less through significant reforms, including cutting in half the time it takes to complete major transportation infrastructure projects.

H.R. 7 also establishes a blueprint for job creation, is responsibly paid for, and includes no earmarks, no tax increases or deficit spending.

As everyone here knows, our surface transportation programs expire on Saturday, and we need to pass an extension in the next few days in order to ensure that these programs will not disrupt the folks who may be furloughed and construction workers who would be sent home.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will act responsibly and put politics aside and join us in passing a short-term extension so we can work on a longer-term solution.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 meets two criteria of the deficit-neutral reserve fund outlined in this budget. First, it will maintain the solvency of the highway trust fund, and second, it will not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal year 2013 through fiscal 2022.

The resolution before us also assumes a new potential funding stream for the trust fund in the form of oil and gas revenues, and ensures that any future funding transfers will be fully offset.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MICA. Both of which are included in H.R. 7.

I would like to confirm with the gentleman from Wisconsin that my understanding of these provisions is correct, and that H.R. 7 is in compliance with the budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Florida is correct in his observations that H.R. 7, as considered by the House, is in compliance with the fiscal year 2013 budget resolution before us today. And we look forward to the final, long-term reauthorization bill.

Mr. MICA. I thank the chairman for his diligence and ongoing efforts to bring much-needed fiscal discipline to Federal spending.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, that was an interesting colloquy, especially given the fact that the Senate has passed a bipartisan transportation bill; again, a bill that has very broad support that, if we took it up today in the House, we could get it passed right now, and it would be good for the economy and good for the fact that we have

17 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

As I remarked earlier, the Republican budget that we're considering would actually cut transportation funding spending outlays by 46 percent next year. That is not good for the economy, and I hope this body will overturn that.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, over the past several months, in hearing after hearing in the Budget Committee, we have heard one recurring theme from our expert witnesses. Chairman Bernanke said it, Director Elmendorf said it, Acting Director Zients said it, and Secretary Geithner reaffirmed that the draconian, reckless cuts proposed by the Republican majority, and made evident in their budget proposal that we are considering on the House floor today, will create an enormous headwind for our economy. Yet, here we are again.

Yes, here we are considering the same Republican budget plan as last year, hearing the same arguments from Chairman RYAN and the Republican leadership.

As I said last week in committee, I feel like it's ''Groundhog Day'' all over again, but Bill Murray is nowhere in sight, and this is no comedy.

In all seriousness, the harmful spending cuts incorporated into this budget proposal go further than simply damaging a fragile recovery. These cuts pull the rug out from under our most vulnerable: our seniors, our children, and those with serious illness.

Democrats reject the idea that the way to deal with rising health care costs is to give seniors a voucher to purchase private insurance and then tell them to figure out how to keep their own costs down.

Democrats believe that we cannot solve our budget challenges simply by shifting health costs and risks onto people who are least able to bear them: seniors, disabled individuals, and poor families.

Last week I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that no one in this body should ever have to offer. My amendment would have prevented reckless and shameful Medicaid cuts to seniors in nursing homes. Like all of the other amendments offered by my Democratic colleagues, this amendment was rejected on a party-line vote. This is simply unconscionable.

As a Member of Congress representing a large number of seniors in south Florida, I can tell you that the House Republican budget would be devastating for seniors and older Americans. This Republican ''path to poverty'' would pass like a tornado through America's nursing homes, where millions of America's seniors receive long-term and end-of-life care.

Sixty percent of Americans in nursing homes are on Medicaid, so cuts to Medicaid would have a dramatically negative impact on our seniors. The Federal Government made a commitment to each and every one of us that when we got older we wouldn't need to live in poverty or force our children into poverty in order to care for us.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. For decades we have looked to Medicare and Medicaid with the expectation that the Federal Government would honor its commitment. Now, under this budget plan, Republicans are trying to back out of our commitment to seniors. We cannot go back on our promise to the Greatest Generation. There is a better way forward.

I ask my colleagues to think about our seniors and our most vulnerable and reject the Republican budget plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to respond to a few of the things that have been said.

First off, it's not the budget that lowers the highway funding next year by 46 percent. It's the current law that governs the highway trust fund that does that anyway.

Let's remember, Mr. Chairman, the highway trust fund is going insolvent. That's under current law. So our budget simply reflects that current law. But we say, let's go get new sources of revenue from oil and gas exploration to go to the highway trust fund, and let's have a reserve fund so that we can go out and find savings to fix this highway trust fund.

But since those bipartisan negotiations are just beginning to take place, since that conference is beginning to take place, we can't include it in this budget. Therefore, we had the reserve fund to be held in order to accommodate that compromise once it arrives.

□ 1530

Medicare. The growth rate of Medicare under this budget is the same one the President proposes in his budget. So for the chart my friend from Maryland used saying this is what the Republican budget does to growing Medicare out in the future, it's the same one President Obama proposes.

Here's the difference: President Obama, in his law, the one being debated over at the Supreme Court, says 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats will be in charge of putting price controls and cuts to Medicare to accommodate that growth rate versus our plan to put 50 million seniors in charge of choosing what health care plan is best for them. More for the poor, more for the sick, less for the wealthy; and it makes Medicare solvent.

Here's the catch: we don't change the benefit for current seniors. This system applies to younger people. Unlike the current law that the President passed, that my friend voted for, 15 bureaucrats are in charge of putting price controls on current seniors' medical care which leads to denied care for them.

So if we're talking about who's saving and strengthening Medicare, it is this budget as opposed to the status quo which raids it, rations it, and still allows the program to go bankrupt.

With that, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of this Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to add my voice to those calling for the passage of the Path to Prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a debt crisis in this Nation. We have a spending crisis in this Nation. This Congress was sent here just a year ago to fix and solve these problems; and we have, for the second year in a row, offered solutions. We have offered ideas, and we will continue to work with the other side of the aisle to try to find what we all believe is a more prosperous Nation.

For too long, job creators in my home State of New Hampshire have paced on the sidelines. They tell me over and over that we want to expand our payrolls, we want to see stability and predictability from Washington first. But that hasn't happened.

Mr. Chairman, it's not asking too much for our Nation to see what good, sound fiscal policy looks like, and we ought to provide that opportunity. We ought to pass this piece of legislation.

The Path to Prosperity gives job creators the confidence to resume doing what they do best: innovate, operate, and expand their businesses and their job opportunities for the rest of us.

It does so by reducing spending $5.3 trillion over the next decade. We slowly bring the deficit below 3 percent of GDP as quickly as 2015, and we have a path to balance this Nation's budget.

We also do this by reforming our Tax Code. Consolidating six tax brackets down to two, 25 and 10 percent, and on the corporate side reducing the rate from 35 to 25, going to a territorial system, allowing the opportunity for our economy to once again be thriving.

The best way to sustain a lasting economic recovery is to remove the hurdles and the barriers that are holding back job creators; and this budget, Mr. Chairman, does just that.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Path to Prosperity, and I call on the Senate to approve it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, a couple of points.

The bipartisan bill that came over from the Senate would provide funding fully paid for, offset for 18 months. So you could avoid the big 46 percent cut next year that's in the Republican budget and make sure folks out there who are looking for jobs in the construction industry could get to work.

Secondly, with respect to Medicare, you have two fundamentally different approaches. The approach we had in the Affordable Care Act was to say we need to modernize the Medicare system by changing incentives. So we reward and incentivize the quality of care, the value of care, not the volume of care which drove up costs.

What we do not do is offload the risk of those rising health care costs onto seniors.

Now the board, the IPAB the gentleman referred to, is specifically prohibited, and I have the language right here, from including any recommendations to ration health care, raise revenue or Medicare beneficiary premiums, whereas the Republican plan expressly works by offloading those risks and those costs onto seniors. A very different approach.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. In Akron, Ohio, Summa Health Care is already implementing some of these accountable care organization methods, the medical home, and saving millions and millions of dollars because of the health care reform bill. I love this idea of we can't have a board that's rationing care.

What are the insurance companies doing today, Mr. Chairman? We act like we're living in a society where the insurance industry is okaying every procedure that needs to get done. They're rationing care right now. We have 40 or 50 million Americans who can't afford health care.

So we're going to throw our seniors now into the insurance market, and we're going to give them a premium support or a voucher—and our friend says it's not a voucher, it's premium support—to help them go out into the free market and buy insurance. But that voucher is only going to go up 3 or 4 percent a year while health care costs are going to go up 5, 10—who knows—15 percent a year. So that voucher every single year goes down and becomes worth less. That's the concern that we have on our side, and that's why we think the reform we put into place was a positive thing.

Then the Medicaid cuts, which people in Ohio use to make sure they can get into a nursing home when they're seniors, get a cut by one-third.

So we're cutting Medicaid by a third, we're basically privatizing the Medicare system into a voucher system, sending our seniors to swim with the sharks in the insurance market, hope that the insurance companies grant them coverage for what they may need. Oh, by the way, you can't really make money off insuring senior citizens. This is the kind of philosophy. This is why this debate about the budget is really a positive one because I think it articulates the two different sides.

Lastly, let me just say this is about balance. The deep, deep cuts in the Republican budget are because they can't ask Warren Buffett to pay a little bit more in taxes. All during the committee process this year and last year, we had our friends on the other side of the aisle who honor Ronald Reagan—light candles, burn incense, put his picture up.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RYAN from Ohio. Ronald Reagan raised taxes 11 times: Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982; Highway Revenue Act of 1982; Social Security amendments of 1983; Railroad Retirement Revenue Act, tax increase of 1983; Deficit Reduction Act of 1984; Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985; Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985; Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; continuing resolution in '87, and a continuing resolution in '88.

The responsible thing to do is to ask Warren Buffett and his friends to help us make sure that these cuts aren't that deep in Medicare and Medicaid and Pell Grants and the other investments that we need to make in this country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I'm pleased to have not only helped author this budget but to stand here in strong support of it. It's a fair budget. It's an honest budget.

The gentleman from New Hampshire said this is the second year in a row that we are telling the truth to the American people. You know, the old adage was ''never touch that third rail of politics.'' Never touch Medicare, never touch Medicaid, never talk about Social Security. Touch it and you will die. We are debunking that myth because that's exactly what it is.

We give credit to the American people by telling them the truth. We have that respect for them. Sixty-five percent of our spending year over year comes out of this House on programs that don't work well and that are bankrupt. They won't be around for our children, and that's these programs right here.

This is what drives our debt: 65 percent of our current spending.

You know what's unfair? It's unfair that in a few decades these programs, as this chart shows, will take 100 percent, will take up all of the revenue that we bring in, the taxes that we bring in as a Federal Government.

Now, some will say, Hey, wait a minute, I paid into those programs; I deserve to take out. Well, that's kind of true as well.

Let's take Medicare for example. On average, we pay in 30 percent of what we're going to take out; and that 70 percent difference comes from the children of tomorrow who don't exist yet, who have no voice in this debate.

□ 1540

It's unfair that no one speaks for them. We do.

We speak for the people in the here and now, and we speak for the people of tomorrow. Immigrants didn't come to this country for wealth redistribution. They didn't come to this country to practice intergenerational theft. They want their kids and they want their grandchildren to have a better life than they did. Our budget does that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The gentleman is absolutely right about the need to look out for future generations and the issue of the deficit. What I always find staggering is the refusal to close one single loophole—just one penny—for the purposes of reducing the deficit so that we can address that issue of the deficits in future generations.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), who has been a great member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the ranking member.

The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation. The budget needs to be fiscally responsible and reduce the deficit, meet our obligations to our seniors and our families and our future, and make targeted investments to grow our economy.

The Republican budget fails to meet all three challenges. It fails our Nation's seniors and our middle class. It fails to ensure that we can compete from a position of strength in a global economy, and it fails to offer a balanced approach to deficit reduction. The Republican budget relies solely on spending cuts. It chooses tax reductions for millionaires at the expense of the middle class, and it chooses tax breaks for the biggest corporations over small business and new jobs.

The most direct assault on our values as Americans is the Republicans' plan to dismantle Medicare as we know it. Rather than protecting the promise of Medicare for seniors now and into the future, the Republicans break that promise. Rather than reducing costs through payment and delivery system reforms, the Republicans do nothing to contain costs, and they simply shift the cost burden onto our seniors. Rather than guaranteed benefits, the Republicans leave seniors on their own to buy what benefits they can afford with a voucher of limited value. This means seniors are subjected to the uncertainty of the insurance industry, meaning possible discrimination based on age, illness, and income. Their budget even cuts health coverage for our sickest and frailest seniors, threatening their access to vital nursing home care.

For decades, Medicare has provided both financial and health security for America's seniors, with access to quality, affordable, guaranteed health benefits. Medicare is a promise to our seniors, and it is a promise that this Republican budget breaks. America's seniors deserve better. Instead, we need a balanced approach to reduce the deficit, to meet our commitments in our Nation, particularly to our seniors, and to create an environment that grows our economy now and into the future.

Reject this Republican budget and choose the Democratic budget alternative, which meets our Nation's challenges in a way that is balanced, fair, and responsible.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say that I keep hearing this word, ''voucher.'' I'm told it polls well if your goal is to try and scare senior citizens. What we're talking about in here is to build upon the bipartisan reforms that have been advocated in the nineties, in the early part of this decade, and most recently on how best to save and strengthen the Medicare guarantee.

First, no changes for anybody in or near retirement in Medicare.

Second, when people 54 or below become Medicare eligible, they'll get a list of guaranteed coverage options from Medicare from which to choose, just like we do as Members of Congress, including, in this case, the traditional Medicare program. Medicare will subsidize their premiums from the plans they choose. If you're low-income or sick, you'll get much more. You'll get total coverage—no out of pocket—for a low-income person; and we say, if you're a wealthy person, you can probably afford more out of pocket, so you're not going to get as much of a subsidy.

That premium grows. We competitively bid. The plans must offer the basic benefit so it protects against health inflation; and as a backstop, it grows no faster than what the President proposes in his.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. In yielding myself 30 additional seconds, Mr. Chairman, here is the difference:

The President's is different. He allows Medicare to go bankrupt. Yet, even with that, he takes a half a trillion dollars from Medicare to spend on his new health care program for other people, and he puts a board of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in charge of denying care by denying prices. It says you can go and cut reimbursement rates to providers and that you can do a values-based benefit design, which is what they propose—whatever that means—to affect current seniors.

We reject the idea that Medicare should be run by 15 unelected bureaucrats. Instead, we want to preserve it for the current generation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the House Republican Conference, a former member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I especially thank him for his national leadership on this pressing issue of the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, last week, Secretary Geithner came up to Capitol Hill to warn of the threat to the American economy of the European debt crisis. Now, Mr. Chairman, the American people know that the greater threat to the American economy is the American debt crisis. We face the absolute worst debt crisis in America's history, and yet it has been almost 3 years since both House and Senate Democrats have submitted a budget—almost 3 full years.

Now, to his credit, the President has submitted a budget. To his shame, it adds $11 trillion to our national debt on top of the $5 trillion that he has already imposed of additional national debt. Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the spending trajectory of the Federal Government is unsustainable. And what does our President do in his budget? He takes an unsustainable spending trajectory and doubles down. He makes it more unsustainable, which makes it unconscionable. Perhaps worst of all, Mr. Chairman, even though he knows what the drivers of our national insolvency are, he refuses to deal with them.

But don't take my word for it. Listen to the editorial pages of major U.S. newspapers, many of which are pretty liberal in their orientations.

The Boston Herald writes:

> President Barack Obama has apparently decided that he is not going to be part of the solution to the Nation's enormous deficit, which would make him, yes, part of the problem.

The LA Times:

> It's past time for the administration to lay out a credible plan for bringing the deficit and debt under control. Sadly, Obama's budget proposal shows that he would rather wait until after the election to have that reckoning.

USA Today:

> The best test of a budget proposal these days is whether it reins in the national debt. The election year budget President Obama sent to Congress on Monday fails that test.

It's pretty clear the President's policies have failed and are hampering our economic recovery. Because they have failed, regrettably, our President has resorted to the politics of division and envy, which is fairly evident in his budget. He has not appealed to the better angels of our disposition and not to the noblest aspirations of our fellow citizens. Instead, he appeals to their basic instincts.

The Nation is truly, truly at a crossroads between two very, very different paths. The President's path is one of crushing, unsustainable debt; a massive tax increase on struggling families and small business; and, most troubling, a diminished future for our children and grandchildren. In short, it is the road to becoming a European-style social democracy of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time to quit spending money we don't have. It is past time to quit borrowing almost 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, so we can just turn around and send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Where the President and other Democrats have failed to lead, House Republicans, under the leadership of our Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, have acted. We have a vastly different path for America's future. It is a path of opportunity. It is a path for economic growth. It is the path to prosperity, and it is the path of fiscal sustainability that, over time, not just reduces the national debt but will pay it off.

□ 1550

Number one, let's look at the differences. Our budget would absolutely prevent the President's single largest tax increase in American history, $1.9 trillion of new taxes to be imposed upon our job creators and other hardworking Americans. And you know what's ironic, Mr. Chairman? Even if you gave the President every single job-hampering tax increase he's asked for, it's about 16, maybe 17 percent of the $11 trillion he wants to add to the national debt. You can't tax your way out of this problem, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. So we know it's the middle-income who will end up paying this.

Second point: we repealed the President's failed health care program, the one that we now understand is going to cost almost $2 trillion, the one that now the Congressional Budget Office tells us will cost almost 2 million jobs, and the one that creates the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as the chairman has said, that includes 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who will begin making health care decisions for our seniors, like my 79-year-old mother, my 83-year-old father. You know, if one of them needs a hip replacement, if one of them needs a heart bypass, I want that decision to be made between them and their doctor, not the 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who have one, and only one, purpose, and that is to impose price controls and ration the quality and access to health care for our seniors.

You know, I hear the buzz line, but it seems to me that ends Medicare as we know it. Looting $500 billion out of Medicare to pay for the President's health care, that seems to end Medicare as we know it. Putting a global price cap, that seems to end Medicare as we know it. And most of all—since we've heard from the trustees of the Medicare and Social Security trust fund that it's going broke—allowing it to go broke, which our friends on the other side of the aisle do, seems to me to be ending Medicare as we know it.

Our budget will end the road to bankruptcy by controlling spending. Under the President's budget, spending has gone from its traditional 20 percent of our economy to 24 percent, and it's on its way to 40 percent over the course of the next generation. Our budget will control spending and limit government so we can have unlimited opportunity.

What is this debate truly about, Mr. Chairman? Here's what I think it's about. And I have shared this correspondence with my colleagues before. I heard from the Calhoun family in Winnsboro, Texas, about this debt. And he wrote me:

Congressman, I have never felt so embarrassed and ashamed about anything I have done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlynn, my precious grandkids. I have written both of them a heartfelt apology for them to read when they get old enough to understand what I allowed our country's governing authority to do to them.

Mr. Chairman, we have no greater moral responsibility than to preserve the blessings of liberty and opportunity for this gentleman's grandchildren and the next generation. It's what we do. We are Americans. We're not just operating on borrowed money. We're operating on borrowed time.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. Two paths. Two choices. One duty. I hope history records that we acted worthy of ourselves, that we acted worthy of our forefathers, that we acted worthy of this great Republic for which so many have sacrificed over the years.

No more borrowed time. No more borrowed money. Let's seize the moment in history. Let's adopt the Republican Path to Prosperity budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the President's plan and the Republican budget, the difference between the Democratic alternative and the Republican budget, is that we take a balanced approach. I think everybody understands that spending cuts have to be part of the solution. This Congress acted last summer, cut $1 trillion out of the budget. But the President and the Democratic alternative also understand what bipartisan groups all understand, which is that the only credible way to reduce our deficits is through a combination of spending cuts and cutting some of the tax breaks to special interests and asking millionaires to pay more.

I keep hearing our Republican colleagues come to the floor lamenting the large deficits and debt which we all agree we need to get under control and then refusing to cut one special interest loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit, asking a millionaire to contribute one more penny for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

Now with respect to the issue of Medicare, the reason it's not premium support is, it doesn't provide constant support to the senior on Medicare. Over time, seniors' purchasing power of this voucher will become less and less while the costs go up and up.

I would point out, again, that Members of Congress have for themselves a plan, this green line, where the purchasing power of their health plan stays constant, even as health prices increase. But this red line here is what they would do to seniors on Medicare.

Now I've heard it said a couple of times now that the President allows Medicare to go bankrupt. Mr. Chairman, here is a chart that the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, presented in the Budget Committee. The black line here is the trajectory that they claim for their plan in terms of cost containment. The blue line is what they acknowledge the President calls for.

As you can see, the tracks are very different. This red line is projected cost increase by the Congressional Budget Office. The difference between the approaches is that the Republican plan puts the risk of being wrong here on the senior, whereas the plan we put forward says we need to change the incentive structures, to change the incentives in a way so that providers provide more cost-efficient care rather than putting that risk on the senior. That is the fundamental difference. And AARP, the largest organization of seniors in the country, agrees with what I have just said. They say in their letter:

The premium support method described in the proposal, unlike private plan options that currently exist in Medicare, would likely ''price out'' traditional Medicare as a viable option, thus rendering the choice of traditional Medicare as a false promise.

They go on to say that the purchasing power of this voucher will not keep pace with health care costs. Let's not put that risk on seniors.

And with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) who has been just tenacious in making sure that we deal with these issues in a fair and balanced way.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the ranking member very much.

The Republican budget makes something very clear, and that is, Democrats and Republicans have very different visions for our great country. The Republican vision is harsh, and independent commentators have said a few things about their proposed budget. They've called it reverse Robin Hood. They've called it disturbing. And they've called it extreme. And I think one of the primary reasons is that the Republican budget breaks the promise that this country has made to generations of Americans that is Medicare.

The fundamental promise of Medicare is if you work hard and you play by the rules and you pay into Medicare every year, as you are working, that it will be there for you in retirement, and you can live your retirement years in dignity. Even in the face of a diagnosis of Alzheimer's or cancer, you will not go bankrupt, and your children will not go bankrupt.

Medicare makes America great. But unfortunately, through this budget, the Republicans say they don't share that view. Specifically, the Republican budget ends guaranteed coverage that our parents and grandparents have paid for, cuts Medicare benefits. It increases premiums and co-pays, and it scraps all of those important democratic cost saving reforms that strengthen Medicare.

I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that would retain closing of the doughnut hole, the annual wellness visit, and other benefits, but unfortunately, it was voted down.

□ 1600

It ends Medicare as we know it and forces the average senior to pay twice as much for half the benefit.

Americans need to ask why. Why do they want to cut Medicare while at the same time protecting corporate tax subsidies and loopholes like the ones for Big Oil? Why do they want to cut Medicare while at the same time increasing tax breaks for millionaires?

The Republican budget proposes a harsh vision indeed, a vision that is contrary to our values for American families.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. To catch up on time, does the gentleman from Maryland want to yield to another Member?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been fighting for jobs as part of this budget.

Mr. PASCRELL. When I was introduced to this budget, the chairman of the Budget Committee stated that his reason for turning Robin Hood on his head was to stop an ''insidious moral tipping point.''

Madam Chair, I can only assume April Fools came early and this budget resolution is a joke.

We're going to steal from the middle class and working poor because we need to stiffen their upper lips and improve their moral fiber.

Let's talk about moral fiber. Where were the morals of the bankers on Wall Street who drove this economy off the cliff? They're doing just fine today. They're not doing time. But the middle class is still struggling and millions of Americans are unemployed.

You don't have to look far to see what the real intentions of this budget are. It's a 30-year pathway to poverty and shrinking the middle class even further.

Don't take my word for it. When asked if his tax plan would hurt the middle class, the chairman of the Budget Committee responded with: I don't know. There's no way to know that. Are you playing Russian roulette with a shrinking middle class?

Madam Chair, let's try and help the chairman figure this out. The $4.6 trillion tax giveaway to the very wealthy in this budget means that the middle class homeowners lose their mortgage interest deduction and property tax deduction, students lose the deduction for interest on student loans, small businesses lose tax credits for buying insurance, and future seniors will have Medicare turn into a voucher program that will make them pay $6,000 more out of pocket by 2022, because this Republican budget cuts $800 billion from Medicare.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MYRICK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Premium support doesn't reduce costs. It simply shifts them to seniors without the guarantee of Medicare benefits.

Seniors like Medicare. Take it from me, they like the security it provides them, and it controls costs better than any private sector plan, and it costs less than any private sector plan. This is not a plan to strengthen Medicare. This is a plan to slowly drown it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 10 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. And leaving no working family's stone unturned, this budget takes 62 percent of its $5.3 trillion in nondefense budget cuts from programs that protect the most vulnerable in this society, which includes food stamps, Head Start, and the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program.

This is a joke.

Thank you for presenting it to us. We'll present our own.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, the hyperbole knows no bounds these days.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just about 2 months ago, I went with my daughter, parked in a church parking lot, and let her take the wheel.

She's 15 years old, and we're in that process of her learning how to drive. I do that because I'm her dad, and I know the dangers that she's about to face. I quite frankly know the dangers to our neighbors around us and their trash cans and their garage if I don't spend time teaching her how to drive. That's my responsibility to do that because I'm the adult and I'm to step up and take the lead when it's there so as to avoid the danger that is coming.

That is where we are right now as a Nation. We can continue to pretend that this is not serious and that we can continue to spend more money; and if we only just spent a little more and if we only tax a little more, we'll tax our way out of this, we'll spend our way out of this. I promise it will get better. I know that we're at $15.6 trillion in debt; but if we only got it to $18 trillion, if we only got it to $20 trillion, then our economy will finally catch up and stabilize.

What the people back in my district say is the same thing that I know: The problem is bigger than that.

If we were 20 years ago saying let's tweak the Tax Code a little bit, let's do a couple of things, we could get a simple fix. It is not like that today. Just this year, we had $1.3 trillion in deficit spending. This President has racked up in 3 years and 3 months more debt than the previous administration did in 8 years.

It is time to make some hard choices, but they are the right choices; and that's what I hear from people back home. They say: Balance the budget. It's not right to take away money from the next generation so we can try to just continue to stir up more programs for us.

It is not right to just create a never-ending list of new options and to say if we just give more money to this group and to this group and to this group, it will fix it. It's not right that we don't protect defense. We have to do that.

People are frustrated. They are talking about the Tax Code. Just tax this person, just do this little bit, just add a few more pages to it. They want us to fix the Tax Code, not just tweak it.

Year after year I hear people saying to me, fix Medicare. Senior adults look at me and they get it. There's a problem. They want us to fix it. They want us to stabilize it. Considering all the things that were said last year, I'm amazed that PolitiFact said that the ending Medicare as we know it was the biggest lie of the year in politics, and it looks like it's in a race to win in 2012 again.

We are not ending Medicare as we know it. We are protecting it for the future because it is unstable. It is going insolvent. It is time for us to repair it and protect it and put it on a path that can be sustained for the days to come.

All the people in my district want is a reasonable, right plan that actually deals with the drivers of our debt, that actually deals with the tough issues and says stop playing with us, we're adults, let's fix this and let's get on with it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, somebody who has said let's fix this in an adult way, a balanced way, the way other bipartisan groups have done is Ms. MCCOLLUM from Minnesota.

I yield the gentlelady 2 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this Republican budget is a political document. It's the House Republicans' platform for November.

The GOP platform puts our economy and millions of jobs at risk. They gut protections for seniors and families in need. They abandon local communities at a time when Washington should be a partner for opportunity and economic growth. The Republican platform cuts student loans and grants for higher education by $166 billion. The Republican budget forces seniors to pay out of pocket an average of $600 additional every year for medications they need because the GOP reopens and throws seniors back into the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

This budget drives Americans into an enormous GOP pothole, gutting Federal transportation investments by 25 percent, abandoning communities and businesses that need improved infrastructure to remain competitive.

This Republican budget cuts regular folks and then protects and showers benefits on the wealthiest and most privileged millionaires and billionaires.

The Republican platform should really be called Millionaires' Manifesto, because it will borrow billions of dollars from Communist China to guarantee every millionaire a tax cut worth nearly $400,000, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. And all that is added to our national debt.

The Republican budget gives oil companies $21 billion in taxpayer subsidies, while they are gouging Americans who are working hard when they fill up their tank at the gas pump and the oil companies continue to make record profits.

The GOP budget sounds extreme. Well, it's only because it reflects the core values of the Tea Party House Republicans: protect the rich, cut off the poor, and walk away from the middle class.

□ 1610

Democrats have a budget that prioritizes deficit reduction and invests in the middle class. Democrats strengthen our American competitiveness by investing in education, basic research, modern infrastructure and green energy: investments that will create jobs. I urge support for the Democratic proposal.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute to make a statement. I'm pleased my friend from Maryland brought our chart down to the floor with his yellow background.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If the gentleman will yield, let the record show that in a moment of genuine bipartisanship, I gave the chairman's chart back to him for his own use.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That's right. I thank the gentleman.

The cap on Medicare that is in law under the President's budget applies to current seniors. That doesn't occur for current seniors in our budget. We don't put this cap because we don't want the 15 bureaucrats putting price controls on care to current seniors. For future seniors 54 and below, Medicare grows at the same rate that the President's budget proposes it grows at. The difference is we don't want the bureaucrats rationing care.

On the purposes of taxes, I love this issue about tax fairness. The President is proposing higher tax rates and more loopholes. Here's the point I'm trying to make.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yielding myself an additional 30 seconds, I'll say this. If you look at the current code, the top 1 percent of taxpayers get almost all the tax shelters, all the loopholes.

So here's the novel idea that we have come up with, and it's a bipartisan one. Get rid of the tax shelters so you can lower everybody's tax rates. And so a person who is parking their money through an average of about $300,000 in tax shelters, for every dollar in that tax shelter that's taxed at zero, we're saying get rid of the tax shelter and subject all of their money to taxation so we can lower everybody's tax rates.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an extra 30 seconds to simply say when eight out of 10 businesses in America file their taxes as individuals, raising these tax rates hits job creators. Sixty-five percent of net new jobs come from small businesses. Half of Americans work in these kinds of small businesses, and my friends on the other side of the aisle are saying it's not enough that they pay more taxes than their foreign competitors; we need to make them pay a 45 percent tax rate in January.

Well, I've got news for you. Countries around the world are lowering their taxes on their job creators, and the President is proposing to raise it. That is a job-killer.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the First Congressional District of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I want to applaud House Republicans for putting this budget forward. And here's why we're trying to save Medicare. Do you see this little green line? That's our Medicare revenue. Now, do you see this huge Medicare green line? This is how much we're spending on Medicare. Now, that's just in the last year. So if you extend that forward, you can see why Medicare as it exists is going broke. So that's why I'm so proud of the House Budget Committee.

What they've chosen to do is come up with a plan that will save Medicare in this way: if you want to keep Medicare, you can keep it. But if you want something like we Members of Congress have, you can elect to have that too. Now, here's what I have as a Member of Congress. When I came in as a Member of Congress, I had a preexisting condition, but the Federal Government couldn't turn me down because of that preexisting condition to acquire insurance. That's the way it would be under Medicare.

Further, I have a choice between about 10 plans. I chose a standard Blue Cross Blue Shield plan, and I knew I could get it filled anywhere in the country, including my rural State of Wyoming. I pay 28 percent of my premium. The Federal Government, the taxpayers, pay 72 percent of my premium. That's basically what they're proposing. You'd have a choice among plans. And you would pay part of the premium, and the government would pay part of the premium. If you're healthy or wealthy, you'd pay more of your premium. If you're unhealthy or unwealthy, you'd pay less of your premium.

Now, you could either choose that, if that was something you've become accustomed to, or if you wanted to choose to be on Medicare as you know it today, that would also be a choice. It seems to me, Madam Chairman, that's a great choice. I support the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, the gentlelady who just spoke is correct that under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan that Members of Congress are on that there is a 72 percent for the premium. That's exactly what that steady green line is. And as health care costs go up, the gentlelady will continue through the congressional plan to get a steady amount of support under the Federal health plan that Members of Congress have. Under the Republican budget plan, in fact, that support drops steadily and deeply, which is why it is not premium support.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, but I'm sad that we are speaking here today on what is an artful dodge on the part of my Republican friends to provide a political document instead of a meaningful budget.

First, as my good friend from Maryland just pointed out, they will slowly, surely, and steadily shift the burden to senior citizens by freezing the amounts the Federal Government will give. And it's interesting that Republicans save, they keep and then spend the money from reforming Medicare that is already ensconced in Federal law now.

This budget sets back an important opportunity to reform our tax program. Their $10 billion of tax cuts over the next 10 years will be somehow offset by closing loopholes, and they have steadily refused to identify what loopholes they can possibly close without hammering average Americans.

You cannot do it. Every independent analyst agrees that this is going to be a massive shift in tax unfairness, and it's going to put a greater burden on most Americans while it gives more assistance to those who need help the least.

As far as closing loopholes, I just spent 4 hours in the Ways and Means Committee where they provided another big tax benefit that they're going to work to try to make permanent in the future. They're trying to have it both ways without being specific.

But I will tell you the area that is of greatest disappointment to me is not just the assault on the most vulnerable. Has anybody talked to the providers in your district about the cuts to Medicare, the frail, the elderly, the poor, the most vulnerable—

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But look at what is happening in transportation. This is an area, until this crew came to town, that used to be bipartisan. We used to be able to bring transportation bills to the floor and pass them in a cooperative basis. We just had a Republican bill blow up because they didn't even have a hearing. It was absolutely a partisan effort, the worst transportation bill in history. Now we're on the verge of losing the construction cycle for this summer because they will not allow the bipartisan Senate bill to come to the floor that would provide stability not just for this construction cycle but for the next construction cycle.

What are the transportation elements of this budget? Look at them carefully. They would not even provide enough money to meet the contractual obligations that States, transit districts, and cities are already involved with. Contractors are at work on projects—

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Contractors are already at work, and their budget would not provide enough money to meet the obligations that we have right now, let alone build for the future. It is unfortunate, it isn't worthy of your support, and I hope you will vote ''no.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the fiscal 2013 budget resolution. There has been some fiery rhetoric that the House budget will end Medicare, but this simply is not the case. Both Republicans and Democrats have worked on plans that will strengthen seniors' health care accessibility and security.

If our country remains on its current path, in 10 short years Medicare will go bankrupt. The Congressional Budget Office warns that in 2022, the Medicare trust fund will run out of money and default on its obligations to current seniors.

□ 1620

As representatives of the American people, we here in Congress have the responsibility to address this growing crisis so that millions of seniors now and in the future will not be left without the vital care that they've earned and deserve. As a father and grandfather, I cannot, in good conscience, pass that burden on to my children and grandchildren—or, for that matter, anyone else's.

The House budget will not only protect Medicare benefits for seniors today but will also ensure its solvency for future generations. It guarantees coverage for current and future beneficiaries, regardless of preexisting conditions.

Premium support programs have had a proud history of bipartisan support and would also give more assistance to lower-income and ailing individuals while reducing assistance to millionaires and billionaires.

Under our proposed fixes to preserve the Medicare program, beneficiaries will also be able to choose from Medicare health plans competing for their business just like seniors currently enjoy with the very popular Medicare part D prescription drug coverage. This will drive down costs, improve value, and increase choice.

And speaking of choice, instead of 15 unelected bureaucrats choosing, we will see 50 million seniors with the freedom to choose for themselves.

With this proposal, those who are at or near retirement—meaning any individual 55 years or older—will see no change whatsoever to their current benefits. Because there has been a lot of misinformation out there, I want to stress that point: no one 55 and older will see any change to their Medicare under this plan.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RIBBLE. Simply put, the House budget will improve Medicare. It will inject financial life into this critical but threatened program.

The Path to Prosperity budget does exactly what the name suggests: it will decrease costs while improving health care quality and coverage for millions of seniors today and millions more tomorrow.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who has been fighting for education, among other things.

Mr. DOGGETT. This budget is based on the false belief that if we ask those who have the least in America to take a little less and we ask those who have the most to thicken their cushion just a little bit, that everybody will be a winner and America will grow. No matter how many times that mythology fails—most recently with the Bush-Cheney tax cuts that didn't grow the economy effectively but did grow the deficit to record levels. No matter how many times it fails, they insist on having a little more of it.

Our contrasting view on tax policy was demonstrated in the committee consideration of this bill. I suggested that we extend the higher education tax credit that I authored so that a mechanic and a nurse with a young person who's gotten their high school diploma in San Antonio, Texas, can walk over to St. Philip's or San Antonio College and have their tuition, up to $2,500—which will cover tuition and textbooks there—that they get that right off their taxes, a tax cut. They rejected that tax cut because they said it would be better if we gave a tax break to billionaires and those at the top of the economic ladder, and eventually that mechanic and that nurse and that young person would see the benefit. I don't think they do. I think they'd like to be able to choose for themselves with a higher education tax credit opportunity for the future.

And the little brother and the little sister there, or in Lockhart or in San Marcos, that want an opportunity to be prepared for school with Head Start and early education, our budget provides for them. It provides opportunity and hope for them. But Republicans insist that they ought to sacrifice a little bit more.

As for our seniors and our veterans, we suggested for veterans that we wanted to provide more job opportunities.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. And as for our seniors, we suggested that getting a certificate to go fish for insurance is no substitute for Medicare.

This is about values, about dignity for those in retirement, and opportunity for our young people.

This Republican budget is not a Path to Prosperity. It's an expressway of retread ideas, an expressway to mediocrity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise today to participate in a debate that Americans deserve but, unfortunately, Democrats want to avoid.

Madam Chairman, the Senate has refused to pass a budget in over 1,000 days; but as Washington races down the road of debt and decline, hardworking taxpayers deserve an honest debate and a real choice. That's why we've come to the floor today.

This budget, the Path to Prosperity, gives the American people a choice between two futures: a future of deficit spending and taxes; or they can choose to set priorities, cut government spending, and keep Medicare solvent for future generations.

Madam Chairman, as I sit here on the floor today and listen to debate, I hear a lot of talk about a balanced approach, about shared sacrifice. Well, Madam Chairman, I believe what Americans are looking for is leadership. They're looking for people who they can trust.

I want to say thank you to the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PAUL RYAN, for leading the Budget Committee in a team effort to bring forward a pathway that shows real solutions to the problems that we face.

Americans are asking themselves who can they trust in Washington. Well, the solution we always hear from the other side of the aisle is let's just raise tax taxes, raise taxes on the rich, let's eliminate loopholes. Well, you know what? I agree. We should eliminate the loopholes, get rid of the credits, the incentives, and make a fairer, flatter Tax Code. But until Washington is truly determined to fix the spending problems that we have, to save Medicare, to make sure that Social Security is around for future generations, I don't think we should seriously look at any tax increases.

We can talk about tax reform, but Americans want us to address what we can control, and that is spending. We can talk about raising taxes or we can talk about tax restructuring. I believe tax restructuring would be a solution where we could find bipartisanship.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I believe that we can deal with the problems that we face in spending without raising taxes, and that we can truly address tax reform in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask that this body seriously consider the Path to Prosperity and support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I think we should engage in tax reform, but I don't think we need to wait for tax reform to get rid of some of the subsidies to the Big Oil companies or to get rid of the subsidies for corporate jets. We can do that now as part of a balanced approach.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the newest member of the Budget Committee—we're pleased to have her on the committee—the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank my colleague for yielding.

We have a real choice to make here, a choice between a Republican budget that hurts the middle class and those who are struggling to get out of poverty, and a Democratic alternative that presents a balanced approach to reinvest in our economy.

It's critical for the communities and employers in my district and around this great country that we continue to support, not cut, research and workforce development, that we renew our commitment to, not cut, public education. These are key areas in which we must invest in order to maintain and accelerate our much-needed economic recovery.

We've seen the private sector dividends paid by the research facilitated by the NIH, the NSF, and the Department of Energy. It's undeniable that emerging solar, wind, and even wave energy technologies will all have critical roles to play on our road to energy independence.

As these technologies continue to develop, we must improve upon, not cut, workforce development initiatives; and community colleges will play an important role in achieving this goal. In Oregon, we've seen exciting partnerships develop between green energy technology manufacturers and community colleges.

Of course, access to a quality education must start well before our children reach college age. Our public schools are the cornerstones of our communities. We have an obligation to ensure that we provide the funding necessary, not cut important quality education that will enhance all of our children's future.

When our children do reach college age, it's important that the option of higher education is available and affordable. Instead of cutting Pell Grants and raising student loan interest rates in order to provide tax breaks for millionaires, let's work to protect our financial aid investments. Continued access to these programs will help prepare our future workers.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 15 seconds.

□ 1630

These programs will help prepare our future workers for their careers in the next-generation technologies.

There's a stark contrast between the Republicans' budget and what my Democratic colleagues and I are proposing. We're at a fork in the road, and I urge my colleagues to avoid the path to poverty by rejecting the Republican budget and coming together to support the balanced approach.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. America is on the economic road to Greece. Our national debt is 100 percent of our gross domestic product. And I want you to think about that 1 minute. Did you ever think you would hear that on the floor of Congress, that our national debt is 100 percent of our gross domestic product?

It's just mind-boggling if you just take a step back and think, for every dollar we spend, 42 cents is borrowed. What would a business do, what would a family do, what would you do with your own individual finances? Obviously, you would change your ways.

Today we have that opportunity. That's what the Ryan Republican budget is all about. Number one, it reduces spending. It reduces spending by over $5 trillion, more than the President.

Number two, it eliminates loopholes in the tax system so that the Tax Code would be fair, competitive, and balanced.

Number three, it reduces the deficit and the debt by over $3 trillion.

And number four, it reduces the size of government from being 24 percent of the economy down to 20 percent. Hopefully, we could even reduce it more than that, and it reduces the size of government without endangering us from a national security point of view, or without pulling out the safety net that's so important to our seniors and our most vulnerable members of society. It does this through commonsense reforms, through elimination of waste, through reduction and duplications.

You know there are 44 different Federal job training programs? If one of them works, why would you need the other 43?

The GAO says there are 19 duplications of effort and procurement at the Pentagon. Let's get rid of them.

Over at the USDA—I happen to know, I'm on this committee—the Federal feeding programs are unbelievable. If you're Bob, and you're 3 years old, Bob is eligible for 12 Federal feeding programs. At 10 years old Bob is eligible for nine. At 35 years old Bob is eligible for seven.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. At 65, Bob is eligible for six Federal feeding programs. That doesn't mention what's going on on a State or local level. These are duplications that Democrats and Republicans alike should agree with, let's eliminate. This is the low fruit.

That's what the Ryan budget does, commonsense reform, elimination of waste and getting rid of the duplications, and putting America on a road to prosperity, so that my children, Ann, Betsy, John and Jim, can live in an economy that's growing where there's opportunities for them. And I urge my colleagues to support the Ryan budget.

BOB'S FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

At age 3, Bob is eligible for 12 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program (FFVP)
4. School Lunch Program (SBP)
5. National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
6. Special Milk Program (SMP) [Can receive if not on any other program]
7. Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
8. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
9. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
10. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
11. Women, Infants & Children (WIC)
12. WIC's Farmers Market Nutritional Program (FMNP)

At age 10, Bob is eligible for 9 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program (FFVP)
3. School Lunch Program (SBP)
4. National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
5. Special Milk Program (SMP)
6. Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
7. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
8. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
9. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)

At age 35, Bob is eligible for 7 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
4. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
5. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
6. Women, Infants & Children (WIC)
7. WIC's Farmers Market Nutritional Program (FMNP)

At age 65, Bob is eligible for 6 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Sr. Farmers Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP)
4. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
5. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
6. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)

At all ages, Bob can receive:

1. Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservation (FDPIR) if living on Indian Reservation & not receiving SNAP
2. Disaster Assistance Program (D-SNAP) if family experiences natural disaster
3. Nutrition Assistance Block Grant (NABG) if family lives in U.S. Territory

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I was interested to hear the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Appropriations Committee, complain about this duplication. Apparently, during the 6 years when the Republican Party controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate, they didn't find any of them. They're late to see them, but better late than never.

The other concern I had was, he talked about duplication at the Defense Department in procurement. But this budget protects the Pentagon and, in fact, increases its spending.

Now, we have been told we should not be talking about cutting Medicare because that's not what's happening. So let me cite The Wall Street Journal, rarely accused of distorting the Republicans' position. In fact, they are defending the chairman of the Budget Committee against the right wing.

And here's what The Wall Street Journal says, because we're talking here not about cutting spending but shifting it. The Wall Street Journal editorial yesterday:

''Mr. Ryan's budget would cancel the additional defense cuts of $55 billion a year''—out of $700 billion—''under the sequester and replace them with savings in the entitlements. His Medicare and Medicaid reforms would generate future savings many times greater than would be gained from gutting the defense budget.''

Now, some of us don't think that pulling out of Afghanistan, with the corruption there, quicker than is now planned would be gutting the defense budget. I know my Republican colleagues like to be critical of welfare in some cases, but they continue to support the greatest welfare program in the history of the world, the American taxpayer subsidy of the defense budgets of the wealthy nations of Western Europe.

But let me again read what The Wall Street Journal says. Here's how they characterize the Ryan budget:

> Mr. Ryan's budget would cancel the additional defense cuts of $55 billion a year and replace them with savings in the entitlements.

Social Security and Medicare.

So in this respect, at least, we're not talking about cutting spending, but shifting it from the military into the

Defense Department. And that's why the AARP has written so persuasively that his plan would, in fact, destroy Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, since defense was brought up, I'm happy to defend our national defense.

I rise in strong support of the FY 13 Republican budget. It's a responsible budget that recognizes that we cannot continue on our current fiscal trajectory. It also acknowledges the importance of a strong defense.

Let's not forget: we're still a Nation at war. We have 90,000 combat forces deployed in Afghanistan as we're sitting here, and while we have no intention of staying there indefinitely, we must ensure that our troops have the equipment and support they need to accomplish the mission. We must also ensure that promises made to our veterans are kept.

We have emerging threats and turmoil across the globe. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Dempsey told us during a hearing on the defense budget that this is the most dangerous time that he has experienced in his long, decorated career, which is 38 years.

This is not a time for further cuts, which can fundamentally destabilize and increase the risk to our forces and the ability to secure the homeland. The President's budget provides the bare minimum for our forces for FY 2013, and would devastate them in latter years, with a planned $487 billion in cuts over 10 years.

The GOP budget ensures that Congress fulfills the constitutional requirement for a strong national defense. It also recognizes the fiscal reality that we face by incorporating the recommended efficiencies provided by former Secretary Gates and current Secretary Panetta.

The GOP budget also addresses the devastating impacts that sequestration, both the method and the amounts, would have on our ability to protect our vital national interests around the globe.

Make no mistake. Sequestration would decimate our military and signal to the world that we are ceding American military superiority. This is an unacceptable choice, and the GOP budget rejects sequestration as a means of addressing our fiscal challenges.

Instead, the GOP budget tackles sequestration head-on by thoughtfully and responsibly dealing with the real drivers of our national debt: mandatory spending programs.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CALVERT. The choice is clear. We can either continue to bury our collective heads in the sand, as the President's budget does, or we can be honest with the American people and make the hard choices now that will ensure America continues to be the beacon of opportunity and success.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the FY 13 Republican budget.

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

Madam Chairman, the President's budget and the Democratic alternative also get rid of the sequester, but we replace that with $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction through a balanced way because we think it's more important to protect that defense spending than it is to protect a lot of the special interest loopholes.

Here's the statement from General Martin Dempsey, the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And he says, with respect to what this budget will do:

> It's a force that's prepared to secure global access and respond to global contingencies. It's a military that can win any conflict anywhere.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not talking about the Republican budget, talking about the President's budget.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

□ 1640

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget.

Our seniors and working families in New York struggle with rising rent, food, and health care costs. Now is not the time to squeeze working families in order to provide tax giveaways to the most fortunate among us.

This budget will mean big cuts to the supplemental nutritional assistance program which provides food assistance to 1.8 million New Yorkers. For students looking to secure an education, this budget will mean drastic cuts to higher education funding, meaning higher costs for students. New York's small businesses and, to that effect, small businesses across this country will see Federal programs they rely on for access to credit and technical assistance reduced by $80 million—exactly the wrong direction to go as we seek to hasten our economic recovery.

Nowhere does this budget fail our Nation more than in the area of health care. Medicaid will be slashed by $810 billion, meaning disabled people, the working poor, and low-income children.

For our seniors who have worked hard their entire life, this budget will mean turning our back on the Medicare guarantee for the first time, pushing the 74,000 Medicare recipients in New York's 12th District into an untested, unreliable voucher system.

Let's be clear: if you vote for this budget, you're voting to end Medicare as we know it.

Madam Chair, the Ryan budget repeatedly chooses millionaires and billionaires over working families. Those are not American values. They are not New York values. We should reject them. Vote ''no.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, in 2011 PolitiFact labeled the line ''this ends Medicare as we know it'' as the lie of the year in 2011.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee and also, I think, a member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I rise to support the Republican budget, and, frankly, I do so with a great deal of pride.

It's the only serious plan that either party has put forward that deals with the looming debt crisis that we face. It cuts $5.35 trillion out of projected spending over the next decade. It reforms Medicare and Medicaid, something everybody in this House knows needs to happen. It actually lays out the blueprint for tax reform. It deals with the sequester in a responsible way. It forces the authorizing committees to finally begin to deal with the entitlement crisis that we face. And it adds $200 billion back to defense spending over the next decade, something, as my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, pointed out, that is very much in our national interest.

This budget is politically viable. It passed the House last year; it will pass the House this year; and, frankly, it got more votes in the United States Senate last year—42—than any budget presented by anybody. Let's contrast that with our friends on the other side.

The President's budget last year got zero votes in the United States Senate, a body that his party controls. Our Democratic friends in the Senate haven't produced a budget in 3 consecutive years, and our friends on the other side didn't do so when they were in the majority, didn't do so last year. I'm delighted, actually, that they will do so this year. I think that's a step in the right direction. But that budget is largely silent on entitlement reform.

My main criticism of all the Democratic budgets is not that they can't pass; it is that they're simply not serious. They don't deal with the problems that the country is facing.

In my experience, Madam Chairman, a plan beats no plan. Our friends on the other side have no plan. We do. It's a plan we should embrace enthusiastically to avert the crisis that faces our country, so I urge its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chair, as the House votes on the budget this week, I remind my colleagues that a budget represents our values. Sadly, tragically, this Republican budget seems to value only cruel Darwinism debasing the American society as we know it to survival of the fittest.

If you value relieving traffic congestion, this disinvestment in transportation throws you to the wolves. If you value job creation efforts like Make It In America, the Republican budget leaves you out in the cold, unemployed. If you value the American innovative spirit, the Republican attack on education leaves nothing but scraps. If you value retirees and those that spent a lifetime making America what it is today, Republicans end the Medicare commitment to you and picks seniors' pockets.

Madam Chairman, the Republican budget disinvests in America. In fact, the only thing Republicans claim to value, fiscal responsibility, rings hollow in the face of a $5 trillion of transfer of wealth to the already wealthy in America by cutting the highest tax bracket from 35 to 25 percent.

Simply put, this Republican budget attacks the America that I and my constituents value.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for this opportunity to speak here tonight.

Madam Chairman, next to me are photos of my daughter, Kate, and my son, Grant. On behalf of my two children and all of the children and grandchildren in America who will be left to pay our debt for the reckless spending that we've done here in Washington that threatens their path to prosperity, I rise in strong support of the House Republican budget for 2013, H. Con. Res. 112.

This budget cuts spending to protect hardworking American taxpayers and tackles the drivers of our debts by reducing government size and reforming our tax system.

The Democrat-controlled Senate has not passed a budget in over 1,000 days, the entire time I've been a Member of this body. The President still refuses to offer credible solutions to the most predictable economic crisis in our history. Empty promises from our President and the Senate won't pay our bills, strengthen our health and retirement programs, fix our economy, or create jobs.

Madam Chairman, today we have a choice, a choice of two paths: a path of mediocrity or a path to prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support the path to prosperity. Vote for H. Con. Res, 112, the House Republican budget for 2013.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, there is no doubt that we have to reduce the deficit and debt for the good of all of our children and grandchildren. The debate today is about how we do it and whether we do it in a balanced way. I would point out the Congressional Budget Office has told us that $2 trillion of the debt over the last 10 years is attributed to the tax cuts in 2001 and 2003.

We keep hearing today about the need, which we all agree, to reduce the deficit, but we still have not heard a single one of our Republican colleagues say that we should reduce one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit so we can deal with this in a balanced manner.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, millions of Americans around the country are focused on March Madness and the basketball Final Four showdown this weekend. But for our Nation's seniors and the middle class, the real March madness is happening right here on the House floor with the Republican budget. This is the GOP's burden of March madness with its own final four:

First, end Medicare guarantee for millions of seniors so that they're out of luck now in Medicare;

Then you move on and you force Grandma and Grandpa to pay more for all of their coverage or forego it in its entirety;

Next, what you do is you put billionaires first. You protect their tax breaks. You put them right up there on the top of the list of the most important people that need help in America today;

Then, fourth, you subsidize Big Oil by keeping the $4 billion for tax subsidies in the budget while cutting, by 85 percent in the Ryan budget, the subsidies, the funding for wind and solar and renewable energy. Tax breaks for Big Oil; cut the programs for clean energy.

□ 1650

So here is the completed bracket for the Republicans: ending the Medicare guarantee; abandoning Grandma and Grandpa; subsidizing Big Oil; and putting billionaires first. That is the Republican Final Four, and it's also the final answer for America.

Yet, unlike the NCAA tournament, the Republican budget doesn't pit these priorities against each other—they're all winners in the eyes of the GOP. The GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party, but now it stands for the Gas and Oil Party. It stands for Grandma is out of prescriptions. It now stands for greed over principle. This is the real March madness—the Republican budget that makes winners out of Big Oil and billionaires while running out the clock for seniors and hardworking families who are left to fend for themselves.

Vote ''no'' on this Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. By that, I am very amused, Madam Chairman.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

The American people have been asking for real and long-term solutions to the very real problems we face as a Nation. For the second year in a row, House Republicans, under the leadership of Chairman RYAN, are doing just that.

I come before you today to echo what many of my colleagues have said time and again: that the budgets that have been presented before Congress and before the American people represent a tale of two futures. I'm referring to the President's budget, which leads us down a path to despair, and I'm referring to the House Budget Committee's own Path to Prosperity.

One keeps us on an out-of-control spending spree, ignores the real challenges facing Medicare, and actually takes money away from seniors and allows sequestration to strip away vital defense spending. The other makes responsible choices that address the drivers of our disastrous debt and deficits, enables us to make good on our promises to seniors, and lives up to our greatest obligation under the U.S. Constitution: providing for the common defense.

I stand before you today as a marine veteran, the only NCO in Congress also actively serving in the National Guard, and as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. To borrow from a recent article in The Weekly Standard, I say to you today that the Ryan plan is more than just a path to prosperity; it is truly a path to security. It is the only plan to come before this body that even begins to address the very real and scary cuts looming over our Nation's military.

I also agreed with the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, when he said that our national debt is our biggest national security threat. That's why I'm standing before you today in support of a plan, the only plan that makes both responsible cuts to our debt and that takes the necessary steps to protect our economic and national security.

I urge my colleagues to support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, perhaps my colleagues on the other side, my conservative friends, either don't realize what they're doing in this budget or they're trying to make sure that nobody else knows what they're doing in this budget because this budget ends the Medicare guarantees and shifts the costs to seniors. Now, this is a simple statement of fact that it either does or it doesn't.

Number two: Those making over $1 million a year in this country will reap an average tax cut of $394,000, while it preserves tax breaks for Big Oil. True or false? It either does or it doesn't.

Number three: It destroys over 4 million American jobs in the next couple of years. True or false? Well, the Economic Policy Institute tells us that it's true.

The last point I would like to get a true or false response from: It raises

Medicare eligibility from the age of 65 to 67. True or false?

I would yield to anybody on the other side who would like to elucidate, or clarify, any of the statements that I have made. I hear no response.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, what the gentleman refers to as simple facts was rated the lie of the year by PolitiFact in 2011.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When you're hearing this discussion, you think: When are we actually going to tackle this problem? When are all of us going to concede that not one party is responsible for this debt but that we all are? We were headed toward this fiscal cliff long before the current President took the wheel. Let's face that. I think we have on this side. Yet leadership requires fessing up to it and actually doing something to change it.

This plan doesn't end the Medicare guarantee—arithmetic does. Unless we change something, unless we put it on solvent footing, the guarantee is gone. Medicare will be bankrupt under the current trajectory. So what this plan does is recognize that and say, if you're currently in the plan, if you're currently drawing benefits, the plan shouldn't change for you; but those who are younger than 55 will need a plan that is solvent, that does work over time. So we're not ending that guarantee. The current system ends that guarantee. We're trying to fix it here.

I commend the gentleman for putting so much time into this. I commend the House Republicans for actually coming up and fessing up to the truth that not one party got us into this but that we're in this situation. This is the only budget being presented, along with one other later, the RSC budget, that actually treats this problem seriously, that treats it with the seriousness it deserves, and that actually has a plan to get out of it. So I commend the House Republicans for putting it forward, and I plan to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I would point out again, just in response to my friend Mr. FLAKE, that this is the chart that was used by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, showing the President's plan on Medicare and the Republican plan on Medicare, both of which have cost containment over the next coming decades. The difference is how you achieve that cost difference.

The difference is that the Republican plan offloads all the risks of what they project to be increasing health care costs on to seniors because, unlike the plan that Members of Congress have, which, as I explained, provides a constant 42 percent premium support share, the Republican plan has the contribution for Medicare rapidly declining relative to the costs of health care, which puts all that risk on seniors.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I start my formal presentation, let me say the gentleman from Arizona is correct. We do need to take responsibility on both sides of the aisle. Very frankly, I will tell my friend we had an opportunity to take responsibility when the Bowles-Simpson Commission voted. There was a vote in the Senate. It was divided somewhat, but mostly they voted for it in the Senate. We had one of our people from the House vote for it, a Democrat. None of your representatives voted for Bowles-Simpson, I guess, because it wasn't perfect. That was a missed opportunity—it was a doggone shame—because that would have made 14 votes, and we would have had that on the floor in the Senate and in the House. I think this is a missed opportunity because I don't think this is a real document.

Now, frankly, I also think that we had a deal. We had a deal as to what the discretionary number was going to be, or as we call it in the jargon of the House, the 302(a) allocation, which the gentleman as a member of the Appropriations Committee knows about. We had a higher number and you had a lower number, and we made a deal in between. We haven't kept that deal. We haven't kept that deal because you couldn't get the votes in your committee, in the Budget Committee, for that deal.

□ 1700

So here we are, Madam Speaker. The chairman of the Budget Committee has spoken of a choice between two futures. He is correct in framing it this way. The budget he proposes would end Medicare's guarantee, cut taxes for the wealthiest, and place our economic recovery at risk.

Robert Greenstein, head of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, described the Republican budget this way, and I quote:

> It would likely produce the largest redistribution of income from the bottom to the top in modern U.S. history and likely increase poverty and inequality more than any other budget in recent times.

Now, that is not a budget on which we proceed where you have a Senate that is chaired by the Democratic Party, majority leader, and a Democratic President. You're not going to get consensus on that kind of a budget.

So this is essentially a statement of purpose and vision by one party, not a document that anybody thinks is going to pass. However, that is a future we simply cannot afford.

In fact, the Republican proposal is not a realistic budget at all, I would suggest to you. Nobody believes in its premises that we, as a Nation, are suddenly going to decide to savage our domestic programs and leave the most vulnerable out in the cold. That's not America. That's not the values that we share as a country.

This disastrous budget ends the Medicare guarantee, increasing costs for seniors. It cuts Medicaid by a third. That's the most vulnerable in America, the poor in America.

My faith doesn't teach me that's the kind of policy I am going to support. I don't think anybody's faith teaches that. We want to take care of those who need the most help.

It will jeopardize access to affordable health and nursing home care for seniors, the disabled, and low-income families who depend upon it.

Furthermore, it repeals the critical patient protection and cost containment policies of the Affordable Care Act. That will cost us dollars.

Their budget slashes funding for programs that help the vulnerable, enable our children to afford college, and provide health coverage to those with long-term disabilities; and it puts millions of jobs and our economic recovery at risk as a result of drastic spending cuts.

At the same time, the budget extends the Bush tax cuts, including $1 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, and cuts an additional $4.6 trillion in taxes on top of that. In fact, you can get tax cuts up to $10 trillion with the Bush extension and the reduction from 35 to 25.

And, oh, yes, we're going to eliminate preference items. We won't tell you what those preference items are. We don't know when we'll eliminate them, but we're going to eliminate them.

I happen to agree we need to look at preference items. I agree with Mr. RYAN on that proposition. I'm just not very confident that, given what happened in Bowles-Simpson, that anybody has the courage to do so.

It does all that without saying how it will be paid for; but presumably, as I said, by eliminating the deductions that middle class families rely on to send their kids to college and afford their homes.

Let me say this: I have said in the past and I will say it again today, we must have a big, bold, balanced deal. That will affect entitlements, it will affect revenues, and it will affect expenditures.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell my friend of my deep disappointment, because I think the chairman of the Budget Committee certainly is one of the individuals in America who could be a part of the solution but is not being part of the solution, is proposing something that is clearly unacceptable to this side of the aisle, to the President. We need to come together and come to an agreement.

Democrats have proposed a different future: one where we invest in a strong economy and ask everyone to contribute their fair share; a future where the Medicare guarantee is preserved and seniors' health security is protected; a future where students who work hard, take responsibility for themselves, and get accepted to college won't have to worry about whether they can afford to go; a future where we help businesses create millions of jobs here at home that won't be shipped overseas; a future, ladies and gentlemen, where the deficit is reduced in a balanced way—that's the key, we all know it's the key—with everyone pitching in.

Any of the Democratic alternatives, in my opinion, will be better than this Republican budget. And I don't agree with everything in each one of those budgets, clearly.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We have a choice today, tonight, tomorrow of two futures, and that choice couldn't be clearer.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I urge you to stand together in defeating this budget and passing one that will bring our middle class and working families not a grim future but a bright future.

And in conclusion, let me say this:

Whatever happens to this budget, any of these budgets on the floor, is not going to be the final word. It perhaps will not even be the beginning word. We need to solve this issue, and we need to do it not by pointing fingers at one another, not by pretending that it's going to be simple, not by pretending that we're going to be able to make happy all of our supporters. We won't be. The hole we've dug is way too deep. The decisions we will make are way too tough. And the only way we will make them is to join hands and look the American public in the eye and say, We have to have a balanced deal. We have to do all that is necessary to put this Nation on a fiscally sustainable path for the chairman's children, for the ranking member's children, for my children, my grandchildren, and, yes, my two great-grandchildren.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes to first say, the gentleman doesn't look a day over a great-great-grandfather.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. First off, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sincerity of the minority whip's sentiment, and he is a man who means that. I know that.

I would say, though, that this process of fixing our country's fiscal path would have been made much better had the President proposed a solution. The President just gave us his fourth budget, and for the fourth time, it doesn't do anything to get this debt under control.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I apologize. I won't because I am under tight time constraints.

And more to the point, Mr. Chairman, the United States Senate, controlled by the gentleman's own party, they didn't pass a budget in 2010; they didn't pass a budget in 2011; and now they've announced courageously that they're not going to pass a budget in 2012 either.

How do you preempt and prevent the most predictable economic crisis in the history of our country, a debt crisis, if the President doesn't propose to do anything about it and the Senate won't even pass a budget?

We're leading; we're passing; we're proposing a solution. We understand the other side would love to just wait for us to offer our solutions to then attack. We don't care about that. We're going to offer solutions. And when we hear the word ''balance,'' watch your checkbook; hold your wallet. It means tax increases. Mr. Chairman, it's math. You literally cannot tax your way out of this problem. The problem we have here is a spending problem. That is why we propose to cut spending.

And with that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I first want to commend Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for actually doing the job that we were elected to do.

As Chairman RYAN pointed out, it has been more than 1,050 days since the United States Senate has actually decided to even address the budget. And yet I look at what they're doing. I can't figure out what they're doing. We are actually doing the job that we are supposed to be doing and doing it ahead of schedule, per the statute, per what this country should be doing, and I am proud of the fact that we are here debating a budget.

I am also terribly disappointed in the President's budget.

You know, it is interesting. As I routinely hear, Mr. Chairman, the Democrats talk about a balanced approach, the problem is the President has never, ever introduced a balanced budget, a budget that even over the course of time, at some point in time, would actually balance. It never balances.

So for 4 years in a row, we're going to have a $1 trillion-plus deficit. Understand what that means for you and your kids.

When I was first elected in 2008, this Nation was roughly in the $9 trillion debt range. Now we're going to be close to $16 trillion by the end of the year.

Now keep in mind: How much is $1 trillion? That number is so large, it's hard to get your arms around it. If you spent $1 million a day every day, it would take you nearly 3,000 years to get to 1 trillion.

□ 1710

We deficit-spend as a Nation $4 billion a day. My State of Utah, their entire budget, everything we do in our entire State is about $13 billion for the year. This Nation deficit-spends roughly $4 billion a day. We pay more than $600 million a day in interest on our debt, and yet the President proposes a budget that over the course of time will get to $26 trillion in debt in the next 10 years where we will see daily debt payments to service our debt. Those interest payments are going to be in a range closing in on $2 billion a day. We can't do this, ladies and gentlemen. There is a proper role of government. We're taking a responsible approach, but we have to cut spending.

The reason I rise in support of this House budget is that over the course of time, we take that spending as a percentage of our gross domestic product and bring it down less than 20 percent.

Under the President's vision, he is fine with spending in excess of 24 percent of GDP. What does that mean? Think of all the transactions, all of the financial transactions in this country, and he is comfortable spending 24 cents of every dollar that is spent in this Nation. That is fundamentally and morally wrong.

But there is a choice. We have put together a plan. We are doing the heavy lifting. We're putting together a budget that's responsible.

I wish we could balance the budget overnight. You can't. We've got to put ourselves on a glide path. There is a proper goal of government. We have to achieve that. I believe that the House Republican budget is bold and realistic.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his great work.

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

The debate we're having here is not whether to reduce the deficit and the debt. We have to do that. The issue is the choices we make in the process.

The President does have a budget; it does take a balanced approach. My colleagues say: Watch out. Well, watch out for the bipartisan Commissions, all of whom have recommended taking an approach that is balanced.

Yes, we have to deal with the spending part. We've cut a trillion dollars. There are additional cuts in these budgets, but we should also end the special-interest tax breaks, and we should ask folks at the very top to take a little bit more responsibility.

Here are the choices that are made in the Republican budget. Here is a very simple one. This is the continuation of the Bush tax cuts for the top 2 percent, $261 billion. Meanwhile, they cut $810 billion from Medicaid. Again, two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to seniors and individuals with disabilities.

That wasn't enough. They apparently are doubling down on tax breaks that benefit the folks at the very top. This is the amount of tax break millionaires will get from continuing the Bush tax cuts. They've added over $260,000 in additional average tax breaks for people making over a million dollars. They say they're going to make that up somehow. I'll tell you how they're going to make it up: by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished assistant Democratic leader, who has been looking out for average working Americans his entire career, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this misguided Republican budget because it fails the moral test. The Federal budget should reflect the values of the American people, and this Republican proposal does damage to those values because it is fundamentally unfair to the middle-income, to the hardworking people of America, and the most vulnerable among us.

This Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantee that working people depend upon after a lifetime of hard work. The Republican budget creates new tax breaks of up to $394,000 for the wealthiest few. This Republican budget destroys 4.1 million jobs. The Republican budget breaks faith with the agreement their leaders made in last year's Budget Control Act to maintain funding for essential services. And this Republican budget protects all Pentagon funds while putting schools, roads, and job creation on the chopping block.

The American people have spoken loud and clear in opposition to these misguided priorities. I urge the House to pass fair and balanced legislation to reduce our deficits in a responsible and surgical manner and invest in important priorities to build a strong middle class.

Growing up in a church parsonage in South Carolina, I learned to put faith into action through firmly held values and high moral standards. This Republican budget fails the moral test, and I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding.

As a freshman, I have the privilege of serving on the Budget Committee. And in years past, the Budget Committee has been all about producing a political document, a document that may make for great sound bites, may make for great television, but doesn't make for great governance. As my friend from Arizona said earlier, the challenge, the $15.5 trillion in debt that has been placed on the backs of every child, every man and woman, every family in this country, has been the path that both parties have chosen.

My friend from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, says there is no disagreement that we have to get the debt under control. Yet the President, who, to his credit, has submitted a budget, submitted a budget that raised taxes by $2 trillion on the American people, but so increased spending as well that the debt continued to climb even faster under the President's budget than it does under the broken system we have today.

Take a look at this. You can't see this, Mr. Chairman, but it's the drivers of our debt. If you look here at the blue line, it is Social Security; and Social Security is a situation that we know is facing peril, but it's facing peril in a predictable way that we'll be able to solve and control.

We see here the green line. It's Medicaid and other health saving in this country, and yet it is growing rapidly. We know how we can begin to curb that spending.

Look at this red line. This is Medicare spending growing out of control. We know it. We know it's true. That's the question folks ask me back home. In this budget conversation, they say: Rob, why does it sound like it's a big Medicare discussion?

The reason is because Medicare is the driver. Medicare spending, the spending that is done through a government mandate where individuals don't have control over their own health care, is driving this debt train.

Going back to my pride at being a freshman member of the Budget Committee, Mr. Chairman, this is a headline from MSNBC. And you know MSNBC is not one of the biggest fans of this freshman class, not one of the biggest fans of this Republican Congress. But this is what they said in a headline from March 15: ''In risky election-year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives.''

That's right. That is why 100 new freshmen came to this body last year. They didn't come to recycle old ideas. They came to offer solutions.

Yes, I know it's an election year, but dadgummit, Mr. Chairman, an election year ought to bring out the best in this body as folks work even harder to fulfill the hopes and dreams of the American people. That's what Chairman RYAN and this Budget Committee have done.

Could they have punted on this, Mr. Chairman? Could they have said, You know what, this is just too hard. We know it's coming, we know it threatens every senior in this country, but let's just punt until after the election.

We've heard some folks who have adopted exactly that attitude, but not this chairman, not PAUL RYAN and the Budget Committee, not this U.S. House of Representatives. It may be risky, but they do it because it's the right thing to do.

□ 1720

And I tell you, Republicans and Democrats alike who were elected in this freshman class in 2010 came to do the right thing for the right reasons, not to follow election-year politics; and I'm just so proud of this chairman for giving us this opportunity.

So what is it that this Budget Committee solution is? Well, what it doesn't do, Mr. Chairman, is change anything for seniors on Medicare today, not one. No changes for today's seniors, whereas the President's proposal makes dramatic changes by empowering this 15-member IPAB board. We preserve and protect Medicare in this budget by providing for seniors—my parents, your parents and your grandparents—providing an opportunity for them to have some say in their health care decisions. We tried that with Medicare Advantage. It's been dramatically successful, and we expand that to give families more choices about their health care decisions. Preserving and protecting the Medicare mandate for future generations, this is the alternative.

Just to be clear, you can't read this, Mr. Chairman, it's the small print, it's all of the small print, that indicates the IPAB board. And it takes a lot of small print to create it because folks were scared to death when this thing was created. There's all sorts of language in this small print, Mr. Speaker, about how rationing will not happen with this board. Why? Because when you put a government board in charge of people's health care, the first thing you think is rationing.

Well, what this board can do is clamp down on what we pay providers. Now, I want you to think about the doctors in your life. I want you to think about those folks.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WOODALL. In your church, in your Sunday school class, at the CVS and at the Walgreen's is where you see those family practice docs. Do you really think those folks are the health care problem in this country? Do you really think that clamping down on more of your neighbors who provide the care to our community is the answer? Because that's the only thing this IPAB board can do: clamp down on those docs, denying care to every senior in this country.

We offer an alternative. It may be a risky election-year move, but it's the right thing to do. And I want to thank the chairman. All the naysayers in this country who said you couldn't, you did. All the folks who said you shouldn't, you did. And you did it because it was the right thing to do. This is a document that can govern our Nation, and it's one that we can be proud of, and I've been proud to be a part of it.

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

I appreciate the comments of the member of the Budget Committee, Mr. WOODALL from Georgia, but I don't think the choice the Republicans make in this budget is the right thing to do. I don't think the American people are going to think it's the right thing to do. I don't think the choice to provide another round of tax cuts for people making more than $1 million a year while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors who have median income under $23,000 a year is the right choice; and I don't think it's the courageous choice.

Now, I heard Mr. WOODALL say that it doesn't change one thing, not one thing in Medicare. That's just not true. This immediately reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole. The Republican plan takes some of the savings we achieved under the Affordable Care Act for Medicare, but instead of using it like we did to help strengthen the prescription drug plan, it reopens it. It does it immediately. That is an additional $10,000 over 10 years for seniors who have high prescription drug costs.

Do you know what else it does immediately? It immediately ends the preventive care services we provided under Medicare. Because we want to encourage seniors to get that early care, so we eliminated the copays. Now they've got to pay that too, immediately.

Now, the gentleman said the President doesn't have a plan on Medicare. I keep having to remind my colleagues that this chart was presented by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. And the black line is the Republican plan, and the blue line is the President's plan. The red line is projected health care costs. And the difference between the two plans is that the Republican plan puts all the risk of those rising health care costs on the seniors. And you can see that when you look at this chart. This is current Medicare. It provides constant support for the health care services received by seniors. That's the blue line.

Here's the green line. This is what Members of Congress and Federal employees get. They get a real premium support. As health care prices go up, their premium support stays constant. This red line, that's what happens when you cap the support for seniors, as the Republican plan did. That red line going straight down is the same as that red line going straight up.

The difference between the approaches is we say, Let's modernize Medicare to put greater focus and incentives on the value of care, not so much on the volume of care, which drives up cost. The Republican plan puts all those risks of rising health care costs on seniors.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, someone who has been fighting for jobs, for fairness, and for protecting the Medicare guarantee, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee for yielding to tell him how proud he makes us all for his important work in constructing a Democratic alternative to the Republican budget, that is, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget proposal that is a statement of our national values that says to the American people what is important to you about the education, health and well-being of our children, the economic security of their families, and the health security of our seniors, those are important values to us; and those values are reflected in the Democratic alternative.

The Republican Ryan bill, on the other hand, I do not believe is a statement of our national values as to what is important to the American people as reflected in their budget priorities. But you be the judge. Would it be a statement of your values if you had a budget that said to seniors we're going to end the Medicare guarantee and you're going to pay $6,000 or more while you get less in terms of benefits, while at the same time, we're going to give an over $300 billion tax break to the wealthiest people in our country? Would that be a statement of your values, this $6,000 more for seniors with fewer benefits, $300,000 or more to the richest people in our country?

Would it be a statement of your values for you, my colleagues and the American people you represent, if you had a budget that said to Big Oil, we're going to continue to subsidize you to the tune of tens of billions of dollars, but at the same time, we're going to freeze Pell Grants, we're going to eliminate them for 400,000 young people and make them less available to over 9 million young people? Lower the benefits for some, eliminate it for others, and use the money to give tax subsidies to Big Oil, Big Oil which is making tens of billions of dollars in record profits each year?

Would it be a statement of your values if you said in your budget that all of those young people who are now children who have a preexisting medical condition—asthma, diabetes, birth defect—any of those preexisting medical conditions, under present law, under the Affordable Care Act, they may not be discriminated against in obtaining health insurance? But the Republican budget says they should be because we're going to eliminate that.

To the 2.5 million young people who are now on their parents' policies until they're 26 years old, this budget says ''no'' to you too. We're eliminating that. We're too busy giving tax breaks to the richest people in America. And while we're at it, with young people just graduating from college, some of them may have student loans, and in the House budget—thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN—in the House budget, we have a provision that says that come July 1, the interest on those loans will not double. We have taken care of that. Under the circumstances, the path we're on, the interest rates would go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The House Democratic budget says ''no'' to that doubling of interest. The Republican budget keeps it the same.

□ 1730

That's just to name a few things that I think may not be a statement of the values of the American people, whether it's interest paid on student loans, availability of Pell Grants to young people, ending the Medicare guarantee, and as the distinguished ranking member said, right now today, overturning the resources that were put in the Affordable Care Act to reduce, to narrow the doughnut hole. Maybe 5 million seniors have benefited to the tune of $3.2 billion already in the bill. Also, there are preventative services; there are annual wellness visits without a copay.

So we're talking about kitchen table items for people where people are trying to make ends meet, where people wonder about if their children will be able to go to college, and if they do, will they be able to have health insurance so that when they look for a job, they can reach their aspirations without having their choices only narrowed by whether they have health insurance or not until the bill comes into full effect.

So there are just a couple of things that I would want people to know about this bill. They are: ends the Medicare guarantee; ends the Medicare guarantee; ends the Medicare guarantee while making seniors pay more for less, while giving over $300 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country. And by the way, did I mention it? It's a job loser.

So I urge my colleagues to enthusiastically support the House Democratic proposal, which is a statement of our values and which our distinguished colleague will present—I don't know if it's tonight or tomorrow morning. I understand that it keeps changing.

The House Democratic alternative invests in America's priorities, creates jobs, protects our seniors and our students, strengthens the middle class. Democrats protect Medicare; Republicans dismantle Medicare. The Democratic plan asks the wealthiest to pay their fair share and put our fiscal house in order; the Republican plan gives them more than the tax break they've had, they almost double their tax break.

Our Democratic plan reflects the most enduring theme in America, the American Dream. Democrats want to reignite the American Dream, to build ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility. It does this by investing in small businesses and entrepreneurialism in our country, by strengthening the middle class. In that regard, we believe that our budget is a statement of our values.

We call upon our Republican colleagues to work with us on a budget that reflects our values. We must work together to protect and strengthen Medicare. We must put people back to work and build a broadly shaped prosperity for all Americans. We must make it in America to stop the erosion of our manufacturing base. We must rebuild America, putting people back to work. We must do this with community involvement. And all of these things strengthen the middle class, which is exactly what our Democratic alternative achieves.

For the sake of our seniors, for our families, for our children, for our workers, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican plan, which ends the Medicare guarantee and makes seniors pay $6,000 or more for fewer benefits while it gives $300,000 in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in the United States. And it costs us jobs to do so and doesn't reduce the deficit until nearly 2040. It's not a good deal for the American people. The Democratic budget is.

I urge a ''yes'' on the Van Hollen budget, a ''no'' on the Ryan Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say, yesterday they said we're cutting taxes on millionaires by $150,000, today it's $300,000—it's probably going to be $1 million tomorrow.

What I would simply say is, this line that says we're ending the Medicare guarantee, let me remind you, Chairman, that this was rated the ''lie of the year'' of 2011 by the nonpartisan PolitiFact.

We don't want a rationing board running Medicare. We want seniors in charge of Medicare. We don't want to take more from successful small businesses that create our jobs and make them uncompetitive in the global economy. We want to take special interest loopholes out of the Tax Code to lower everybody's tax rates, but especially those of small businesses that create our jobs. And more importantly, we want to balance the budget, pay off the debt. Ours is the only budget that does that. The so-called ''balanced'' approach by our friends on the other side of the aisle doesn't even pretend to get the debt paid off, let alone under control.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when President Obama released his nearly $4 trillion budget proposal in February, he called for more spending, more borrowing, and more taxes. Despite a national debt that's grown to more than $15.5 trillion, the President elected to double down on the same old failed agenda.

The Senate has failed to pass a budget for more than 1,000 days—the IPAB wasn't on the margin when they had a budget the last time in the Senate—while House Republicans are actively working to address the economic crisis facing our country.

Americans deserve better than empty promises from a broken government, and the Path to Prosperity budget offers a tangible way forward. This budget cuts spending in a meaningful way, lowers tax rates while simplifying the Tax Code, and strengthens the social safety net.

I ask the Senate and House Democrats, what's your plan? There is no greater contrast between the President's budget and our Republican budget than on Medicare—something I know something about having practiced medicine for 30 years. The President and congressional Democrats cut $500-plus billion from Medicare to fund a new entitlement, and then their cost controls were a 15-member board, a bureaucratic board—basically a denial-of-care board.

No one argues that Medicare goes bankrupt in the near future, so doing nothing is not an option. Republicans propose to strengthen Medicare for current seniors by making no changes for those 55 and older, and giving future retirees the ability to choose their own health plan—what a novel idea that is—including a traditional Medicare choice, the same thing they have today. By implementing these commonsense reforms, we can ensure Medicare will be available to current and future generations.

I am very proud of my colleagues on the House Budget Committee who have worked tirelessly to draft a blueprint that sets our Nation on a path to balancing the budget and paying off the debt. This proposal protects the country, saves Medicare, and puts America on the path to prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the chairman of the Budget Committee has mentioned a number of times this PolitiFact. I want to read from what PolitiFact said with respect to this. He said that it's true that the term ''terminate'' Medicare, which some had used, was an overstatement. No doubt about it. Just like, apparently, a couple of years ago they've said—what I've heard from a lot of my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act was a ''government takeover of health care.'' I've heard that a lot from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That was the big PolitiFact so-called ''lie of the year'' a couple of years ago. So let's just be clear.

But this is the important part. It says: If Democrats had just slightly tweaked their statements, they would be accurate. They go on to point out that, for example, when people said the plan last year would privatize Medicare, that was true. And that President Obama was also more precise with his words saying that the Medicare proposal ''would voucherize the program and you potentially have senior citizens paying 10,000 or more.'' They didn't say that was false.

What we have said, what I have said very carefully all along is that it ends the Medicare guarantee. And I firmly believe it ends the Medicare guarantee for this reason, for this reason right here: this is the current Medicare plan support for seniors in terms of the percent that they have to pay, that blue line, steady support. Green line demonstrates steady support that Members of Congress get from the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. Red line is what happens when you put seniors into the private health care market but you don't allow their premium support to rise with the projected rise in health care costs. Red line, down. I think that does end the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1740

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, there's been an understanding in our country for a very long time that if you work as hard as you can your whole life and you follow the rules, that one of the things that you'll get as part of this American Dream is a secure retirement; that you ought to be able to spend the years after you work loving your grandchildren, pursuing your hobbies, doing the things in life that you love and enjoy.

Essential to that part of the American Dream is the Medicare guarantee, because here's what it really says. If you get sick and you need help, you get the help that you need as determined by you and your doctor and your family, and you pay your fair share in premiums and copays, but there's no insurance bureaucracy to run through. There's no approval you've got to get. If your cardiologist says you need a certain procedure and you think that you want to do it, you do it, and Medicare pays the bill.

This is a guarantee, and the reason it's needed is that you can't make a whole lot of profit off of insuring older and sicker people. So since 1965, this Medicare guarantee has been a part of the promise that we've made to American seniors.

This budget violates that promise because what it says is a substantial number of people, beginning with those under 55, will not be in Medicare. They'll be in a system run by the insurance companies of this country, and the decision will shift from people and their doctors to insurance companies.

Now, the other side will say, Well, it's going to be voluntary. Well, here's what, in all likelihood, is going to happen. The wealthier, healthier people will sign up for the voluntary system, and the poorer, older, sicker people will stay in regular Medicare. The resources will diminish, the care will dwindle, and Medicare will wither and die on the vine.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. This obviously is a good faith and legitimate philosophical difference. But when it comes to the termination of the Medicare guarantee, when it comes to jeopardizing and violating this covenant with the people who built this country, we think that's the wrong thing to do. And it's especially wrong when the savings—so-called savings—from this approach will finance yet another tax break for the wealthiest and most prosperous people in our country.

These are priorities we'll debate on this floor in good faith. We think they're the wrong priorities. We urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 2 minutes to say, you know what ends the Medicare guarantee? The Medicare status quo.

We had the chief actuary of Medicare in the other day. He said it is $37 trillion in the hole. That's the unfunded liability for Medicare.

Look at the driver of our debt. Medicare is growing at such a rate that it goes into bankruptcy, the part A trust fund goes bankrupt in 2021, according to CBO.

Now, what does the President's law, the current law in law, do?

It says we need to slow the growth of Medicare spending by putting a cap over Medicare. That's in law today. And then it says, in order to enforce this cap, we're going to have 15 political appointees that the President will appoint for 6-year terms. They make the decisions. They decide what health care providers can do or cannot do and what they get paid.

The Medicare chief actuary came and told us the other day, they'll start off by paying Medicare providers 80 cents on the dollar to provide Medicare benefits and then go down to 30 cents on the dollar.

You think your doctor's going to do what you need if he gets paid 30 cents on the dollar?

He said that 40 percent of Medicare providers are either going to go out of business or just stop taking Medicare patients altogether. That's the current law. That ends the guarantee.

Here's what we say:

Get rid of the rationing board. Stop the bureaucrats from getting between the doctor and her patients. And don't change Medicare for people 55 and above so that you can keep the promise the government's made to them. But for those younger generations, because the program is going bankrupt, you must reform it in order to keep the promise to current seniors.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 1 minute to say this:

And the way we keep the Medicare guarantee is to save this. You get a list of guaranteed coverage options from Medicare, and among those choices are comprehensive private plans and the traditional Medicare option, and Medicare will subsidize your premiums.

Those subsidies go up every year. If you're low-income, all of your out-of-pocket costs are covered. As you get sick, more and more coverage to prevent you from having sticker shock. And if you're wealthy, yes, more will be paid out of pocket because we think you can afford it.

That saves Medicare. That makes it solvent. And the competitive bidding that is done to make those providers compete against each other for our business, using choice and competition, is what the Medicare actuary tells us is the best way to preserve and save the Medicare guarantee.

You see, premium support with competitive bidding ensures guaranteed affordability. This is an idea that has had bipartisan support going back to the nineties. Yet our friends on the other side of the aisle would rather have politics than to really work to save the Medicare guarantee.

I yield 3 minutes to the doctor from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding to me.

We've heard our Democratic friends talk about IPAB, of which Chairman RYAN was just discussing. These 15 bureaucrats are nothing but a backstop, a backstop there to cut lower Medicare spending.

In baseball parlance, Mr. Chairman, backstop is sometimes synonymous with the catcher, a catcher who literally will throw every senior out at second base.

I like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, my classmate, Mr. ANDREWS, who just spoke, but we're a country of laws and not of men, and I don't like anything about their budget.

Our budget incorporates the Ryan-Wyden plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy and health care rationing. Therefore, it's with deep concern for seniors that I've listened to my Democratic colleagues suggest that the bipartisan Ryan-Wyden plan will end Medicare as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot stress this point enough: Medicare, as the chairman just said, Medicare will be bankrupt as early as 2016 because ObamaCare already ended Medicare as we know it. It stole $575 billion from Medicare in order to pay for ObamaCare.

I offered a simple amendment during ObamaCare that said any Medicare saving must go back into Medicare to save Medicare. Who could disagree with that? Well, the Democrats in the House did. Twice they defeated my amendment. Republican efforts to save Medicare from bankruptcy were thwarted by House Democrats because President Obama needed a piggy bank to pay for ObamaCare.

Today we have a bipartisan plan to save Medicare, created by House Republicans and Senate Democrats who put partisanship aside because our seniors need us to save Medicare from bankruptcy and save them from ObamaCare. If the Democrats vote against this plan to save Medicare, will they put forward their own plan to save Medicare? They're going to have an opportunity, indeed, even to vote for the Obama budget recommendation as well as their own.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard a great deal of rhetoric from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, yet the silence on my question today has been deafening because they don't have a plan. And I hope they will stand up now and prove me wrong by telling me what is their plan.

Mr. Chairman, not only does this budget responsibly reform and save Medicare, this budget also charts the path to fiscal discipline that is long overdue in this city. H. Con. Res. 112 lowers spending by $1.1 trillion below even what the House passed last year. This budget proposes $5.33 trillion below what President Obama proposed in his own budget.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this budget makes broad tax reforms that will prevent a $2 trillion tax increase from taking effect January 1, 2013, will spur economic growth by lowering taxes to individuals and job creators, and it proposes a 25 percent—25 percent—corporate tax rate to promote domestic economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, it's time that we think of the next generation and not the next election. This Path to Prosperity charts a responsible course for the fiscal health of our country, and I urge all of my colleagues, support H. Con. Res. 112.

□ 1750

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing my Republican colleagues say that their plan will provide seniors with affordable premiums for their health care services. I just keep asking myself why it is that their plan gives seniors on Medicare a much worse deal and a lot less support than the plan Members of Congress have under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. That is a real premium support plan. That is a plan where the premium support keeps pace with rising health care costs.

So if you're talking about how to deal with Medicare, it seems to me that you should take the approach that we have taken, that the President has taken, where you modernize the system, you change the incentives to put focus on the value of care, on the quality of care rather than the quantity of care.

We're already starting up accountable care organizations. We're already starting up different methods of delivering care and different payment systems. That's a very different approach than putting the burden on seniors and putting the risk on seniors.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady who represents the Nation's capital so well, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his brilliant and balanced work on the budget.

Shakespeare's sonnet says, ''Let me count the ways.'' I am finding it difficult to count the reasons to oppose the Republicans' unbalanced, no-growth budget that threatens to send us back into a recession.

But when the tightest fist in the Federal Government, the OMB, says that the Republican budget would, and here I'm quoting, make it ''extraordinarily difficult for the Federal Government to do its basic business,'' I listen.

The Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, is labor intensive. When the OMB says that there will be 4,500 fewer Federal agents on the border, working criminal cases and performing national security, I listen.

When the OMB says we won't be able to meet basic standards for food safety, I am listening.

We simply cannot keep freezing pay for Federal employees, which amounts to deep cuts or replace every three with only one employee and expect to continue protecting the American people at the same time.

The Republican budget kicks Federal employees while they are down and kicks their vital work right along with them. It guarantees the growth of the unaccountable contractor sector, which remains untouched in the Republican budget.

So much for the phantom savings at the expense of Federal employees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for yielding 3 minutes to talk about such an important subject as the health care of our seniors.

You know, the other side of the aisle wants to play pretend. Let's pretend that we have a program sustainable for all future generations. Let's pretend that all our seniors right now have access to all the medical care and physicians that they want. Let's pretend that the Medicare program that the President's health care reform bill establishes for our seniors allows seniors and their doctors to choose what care is best for them.

But, Mr. Chairman, we would have to be playing pretend because, in fact, we know that the program is not sustainable for all generations. This graph here is not from the Republican conference. This is from the Congressional Budget Office. This is what happens, the red. It's no accident that it's in red. This is what happens to Medicare spending under the President's proposals.

We are right here in the middle. This is when my children reach their middle age. This is when they retire. This is when my grandchildren reach their retirement. It's not sustainable. Anyone looking at that graph knows it's not sustainable. We can't play pretend.

We would have to play pretend that all seniors have access to physicians. Go into my district in rural areas where seniors tell you they don't have access to primary care already because the Medicare program currently squeezes the payments, the providers to where providers no longer choose to take on as many Medicare patients as they can. The President's plan makes it even worse.

Finally, we would be pretending that patients get to choose and their physicians get to choose their care because under the President's plan, there are 15 unelected bureaucrats who decide, that President's rationing board, who decide what care my mother now will get, what care I'm going to get in 10 years, what care my son is going to get in 39 years when he reaches retirement age. Fifteen unelected bureaucrats, Mr. Chairman, by law only a minority of that board can ever have practiced health care. The majority are bureaucrats never having taken care of a patient. That's the plan that we have now.

Mr. Chairman, it will break if we don't take care of it.

I applaud the chairman of the Budget Committee for the bravery; and, Mr. Chairman, you know what the ads are going to be. You can see it now. You can hear all the talking points. America knows health care in America needs repair. They know the Medicare program needs repair if we're going to preserve it for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to choose this as the repair for our future generations.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, put up a chart with the red showing the rising costs of Medicare and said the President has no plan. Well, I wish the gentleman had looked at the chart of the chairman of the Budget Committee. We've seen it a couple of times today. It shows the black line being the House Republican trajectory, the blue line being the President's plan to contain costs. The difference again being that the Republican proposal puts all the risks of rising health care costs onto seniors, whereas the President's plan talks about changing the delivery system in a way to encourage the value of care, focus on the value of care, rather than the volume of care.

I would only point out that we keep hearing about the IPAB. The reality is that anything they would propose, number one, by law cannot ration care. But number two is subject to review and a vote by Members of Congress, the people in this body.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. I've been listening to this debate; and you know, the Republicans' claim that they're saving Medicare is political mythology.

Essentially, what they're doing is shifting coverage to the private sector. They have a cap more stringent than that in the Affordable Care Act. So over time, more and more there is the erosion and the end of Medicare.

I want to say just a few words about the tax provisions in the Republican budget.

On Sunday, this is what was said: I don't know. That's what the Republican budget chairman said on Sunday when asked whether the middle class would suffer under his tax proposal.

□ 1800

It's important for the American public to know the facts. The Republican budget would cut taxes for the very wealthy. The top tax rate would be reduced by such a significant extent that, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the average millionaire would receive $265,000 in tax cuts. To pay for this tax cut, the Republicans would have to put on the chopping block provisions in the Tax Code relating to health, education, the home mortgage interest deduction, and pensions.

Mr. RYAN, you call these loopholes. No, these are policies. For example, four-fifths of the benefit of the health care exclusion goes to households earning less than $200,000. Half goes to those earning less than $100,000. Then 70 percent of the benefit provided through the home mortgage interest deduction goes to families who earn less than $200,000.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Yet the provisions that, in fact, disproportionately benefit the wealthy, including the reduction for capital gains and dividends, the Republicans would protect from any changes.

The Republican priorities could not be clearer when it comes to Medicare: end it. As to their tax provisions: help the very wealthy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee and also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to commend Mr. RYAN for standing up for the future of our country and for his dedication to fundamental American principles.

Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Michael Mullen, said last year that the greatest threat to our national security—the greatest threat to our national security—was our debt. Now, there are clear differences—you've heard them here today—about how we should address that debt. Americans have a choice to make, and it is a choice that will determine the future of our great country. By ignoring the drivers of our debt, by ignoring Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, the President's most recent budget proposal ensures a future of ever-increasing debt and doubt and decline. In fact, before the Budget Committee, Mr. Chairman, we had earlier this spring Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, who admitted of the administration that they don't ''have a definitive solution to our long-term problem. What we do know is we don't like yours.''

Now there is real leadership.

The President's health care law, the current law of the land, cuts Medicare by more than $500 billion for more government programs. The President's health care law ends the Medicare guarantee and puts us on this red path over here, Mr. Chairman, increasing the amount of debt that gives the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff pause to say that the greatest threat is our debt.

The President's health care law empowers the Independent Payment Advisory Board to effectively deny care to seniors. You've heard about it—15 unelected bureaucrats. None of them—none of them—can be actively practicing physicians. As a physician, I can tell you that gives me great pause.

You heard the gentleman from New Jersey down here, saying that, in their program, if a doctor says that you need cardiac surgery, you get it. Well, on the contrary, Mr. Chairman. In fact, if a doctor says you need cardiac surgery and if the board of unelected bureaucrats says you don't get it, guess what? You don't get it.

Then my friend from Maryland says, Oh, no. You can bring it to the floor of the House. You can bring it to Congress. You could have a review and vote on the floor of the House for your cardiac surgery.

Hardly, Mr. Chairman. It just isn't going to happen. The fact of the matter is this unelected board is charged with finding $500 billion in reductions in payments to Medicare physicians. Consequently, what will happen is that it will essentially deny care to seniors.

As a physician, I believe that the President's health care law threatens all of the principles that we hold dear: accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, choices. Every single principle of health care is violated by the President's health care law. It destroys the doctor-patient relationship. Yet it's not just devastating to the future of our health. It's also devastating to the future of our economy, which is, again, what drives the chart. Where is the middle class, Mr. Chairman, on this chart? In the red. Where are the American Dreams of our kids and grandkids? In the red.

So we are committed to the full repeal of the President's health care law, and today we advance bipartisan solutions to improve and to strengthen Medicare. Where the President and Democrats fail to act here in Washington, we will lead.

Our plan has no changes for those in or near retirement. It allows choices, including the Medicare option, so that patients control their health decisions, not bureaucrats. When bureaucrats choose, patients lose. In the future, Americans, through a guaranteed system—read the bill, Mr. Chairman—will be able to select the health coverage that is right for them, not what Washington says they must have. Our solution is guaranteed, it's voluntary, and it's bipartisan—something our friends on the other side of the aisle simply cannot say.

Our plan also includes commonsense tax reform—closing loopholes, lowering rates, broadening the base, helping job creators. It's a system that is more fair and more simple and that allows us to compete in the world because a vibrant and robust, growing economy is necessary to get us back on the right track, and the right track is the green path here, Mr. Chairman, that gets us to a balanced budget and paying off our debt.

Now, we know that the Senate won't adopt our budget. Remember, they haven't done one in over 3 years. So the solution to the Senate and to the Presidential gridlock is with the American people. It's the people of this great country who will decide the direction that we take, not Washington. It's the people who will decide. We offer a positive budget, a positive plan, for both our health care and our economy. It's a path to prosperity, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would just urge my friend Mr. PRICE to again look at the chart presented by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, which makes it clear that we have different paths, different approaches, with respect to containing costs. Yet, at the end of the day, the trajectories are the same.

I'll say again that if Republicans think the notion of the premium support plan—the voucher plan, whatever you want to call it—which doesn't rise with health care costs, is such a good deal for seniors, why are they giving themselves a different deal in the health care plan for Members of Congress?

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that we are facing difficult fiscal challenges and that we absolutely have to get our fiscal house in order. Obviously, that means that we have to make smart budgetary decisions and invest our dollars wisely in those things that will yield the greatest benefit. However, it doesn't mean that we just cut for the sake of cutting.

I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget, which eliminates the Medicare guarantee as we know it. Particularly, it eliminates the Medicare guarantee for my constituents in Rhode Island, our seniors. It also cuts programs that keep my constituents' homes heated, that help families afford college, and that ensure proper access to health care.

I rise in opposition to slashing infrastructure spending that literally prevents our bridges from falling down, as well as gutting investments in education, medical research, and emerging technologies, which provide key areas for job creation.

Finally, I rise in the strongest opposition to cutting these vital programs and economic investments while at the same time maintaining tax breaks for millionaires, Big Oil, and Wall Street.

Mr. Chairman, our budget reflects our values and our priorities, and the Republican budget prioritizes the wealthiest Americans at the expense of everyone else. I urge my colleagues to reject this measure and to support the Democratic alternative, which keeps our promises to our seniors, preserves our social safety net, invests in education for our children, invests in creating a 21st century infrastructure for a 21st century economy, and that asks all Americans to pay their fair share toward reducing our deficit.

□ 1810

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I just have one more request for time, and then I will reserve the right to close. And I understand the gentleman has a number of other requests, so perhaps he would like to continue with his speakers?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in very strong opposition to the Republican budget, which really is a path to more prosperity for the 1 percent.

Once again, the Republicans are proposing a budget that pays for tax cuts for the very wealthy at the expense of senior citizens and the most vulnerable Americans. At a time when America faces the greatest—mind you, the greatest—income inequality since the Great Depression, this Republican budget would continue the largest wealth transfer in history to the top 1 percent. It would recklessly deny support services to the poor and the hungry, end the Medicare guarantee, and destroy American jobs, while preserving tax breaks for millionaires, special interests, and Big Oil.

That's not all. While the Republican budget crushes the American Dream for those striving to become part of the middle class—of course, that's the poor and the working poor—it would increase spending for an already bloated Pentagon budget and continue the war in Afghanistan at a time when seven out of 10 Americans believe the war should come to an end.

We cannot do this to America's struggling families and our seniors or low-income individuals. I urge all

Members to reject this Republican budget and, instead, support the budget proposals put forth by Congressman VAN HOLLEN and the Democrats, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from California.

Ms. LEE of California. A budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and our values.

How can we allow this Medicare guarantee that our seniors have contributed to throughout their lives to be turned into a privatized voucher plan? Where is our sense of morality? Allowing our seniors to really just begin to fall through the cracks, that is just wrong.

We need a budget that puts Americans back to work, that invests in our future, that protects the safety net, including Medicare, and works to reignite the American Dream for all and not crush it for all but the wealthiest 1 percent.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Education Committee, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And just like last year, some Members of Congress and beltway talking heads are declaring the Republican budget proposal as bold and courageous. But just like last year's Republican budget, this budget proposal is neither bold nor is it courageous.

It's not bold to balance your budget on the backs of working families, low-income families, and the children of this Nation. This Republican budget, in fact, mortgages an entire generation of children's education and young people's education. It mortgages their educational opportunities by making cuts at the very earliest of early childhood education, at the elementary level of education, the secondary level of education; and it's going to allow the doubling of interest rates on student loans that families have taken out to provide for the higher education that these young people need to get jobs in this economy, to get the skills that they need to be able to go to work in this economy. Yet that is going to be slashed with their cuts, with their increased costs to those individuals.

It also sacrifices the health care benefits of a generation, of these same people, because under their proposal they envision the Affordable Care Act somehow going away, that they can repeal it, they can get rid of it. And that means that young people will not be able to stay on their families' policies as they finish their education or they seek out their first job, their first beginning of a career.

It also ends the Medicare guarantee. It follows the path that George Bush followed when he wanted to privatize it and then again in last year's budget, when they sought to end the guarantee. They're back again to end that guarantee to our senior citizens. It's not bold. It's just plain wrong.

The Affordable Care Act, in fact, strengthened Medicare. It made it more sustainable for seniors and sustainable for the taxpayers. It extended the Medicare trust fund.

But that's not what the Republican budget's about. It's about extending the deficits out until sometime in 2014, while at the same time not looking at the impact of military spending or continuing the war in Afghanistan, as they accept it in their budget.

And what it says is, therefore, we will shift the entire cuts to the young, to the old, to middle class families. But that cannot be allowed. The Republican budget must be rejected by this House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his good work on this budget.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote:

To preserve the independence of the people, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

In this choice of two futures, unfortunately, Congress has all too often chosen the latter path of out-of-control spending and expansion of government power. There is a spending addiction in Washington, D.C., and it has proven to be an addiction that Congress has not controlled on its own.

The Nation has gone, in a few short years, from a Federal deficit of billions of dollars to a deficit of trillions of dollars. The government is printing money at an unprecedented pace, which presents significant risks of inflation. Our debt is currently an unfathomable $15.5 trillion and mounting rapidly, as is the waste associated with paying the interest on that debt. Yet Congress has done little to address this crisis.

Families all across our Nation understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford. Yet far too often, this fundamental principle has been lost on a Congress that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line. Americans must exercise restraint with their own funds, then government officials must be required to exercise an even higher standard when spending other people's hard-earned money.

While I believe that the House budget we are considering today is a good budget and I support it, it is dependent on fiscally minded Congresses being elected for the next 28 years who will be committed to upholding this budget, as well as a President who will sign fiscally responsible appropriations measures into law. That is why I am also a supporter of the Republican Study Committee budget. While this RSC budget is bold and some say drastic, these measures are needed to solve our Nation's fiscal crisis.

Mr. Chairman, unless each Congress—regardless of party affiliation—is forced to make the decisions necessary to actually set a budget—unlike the U.S. Senate—and create a balanced budget, the temptation will always be there for Congress to spend more than it receives in revenues. And that is the advantage of a constitutional balanced budget amendment which would ensure that the principle of fiscal responsibility is forced upon all future Congresses.

The balanced budget amendment is a commonsense approach to ensure that Congress is bound by the same fiscal principles that America's families face each day. I am pleased that the Republican Study Committee proposal seeks to balance the budget in 5 years and puts us on a path to save Medicare.

Finally, I urge this Congress to demonstrate leadership and make the tough but bold decision to stop the government spending spree. We cannot continue to saddle our children and grandchildren with debt that is not their own.

I support the Republican Study Committee budget. I support fiscal responsibility.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1½ minutes to Mr. WELCH of Vermont, a gentleman who has been focused on fiscal responsibility.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the budget challenge we face requires two things: first, it requires the confidence to invest in the future and rebuild the middle class; second, it requires the discipline to bring down our debt with a plan that recognizes what is obvious to all Americans, that any plan with any prospect of success must include spending cuts and revenues.

This budget, instead, makes things worse and delivers a body blow to the middle class. It doubles down on tax cuts, adding $150,000 in cuts to the wealthiest Americans. It increases Pentagon spending, fencing it off from it being required to make any contribution to reducing our debt. And that body blow to the middle class, it's delivered by cutting Pell Grants, kicking kids off of work study, by taking away things that the middle class needs, a functional Food and Drug Administration, FAA, cuts in national science. It is really bad for the middle class.

Americans know that a budget is much more than line items on a spreadsheet. It's about who we are and what we aspire to be. And the question is this:

This budget believes in austerity. It leads to prosperity; no evidence for that. This budget believes that tax cuts for the wealthy will create jobs; no evidence for that.

In our budget, we believe something very simple:

We're all better off when we're all better off, and that requires a budget that reflects what has always made America great: investment in a middle class that's strong and that's enduring. Our hope in passing any budget has to be that the middle class will be strengthened and that parents will have some confidence that their kids will be better off than they were.

□ 1820

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I am the last speaker. I reserve the right to close. So I will let the gentleman from Maryland use up all his time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I stand in strong opposition to the Republican budget that we are considering here today.

How easy it is for some to forget that when President Bush took office, we had surpluses as far as the eye could see, and when President Bush left office, we were left with a deep pool of red ink.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the urgency of reducing our deficits, but where were my deficit-concerned colleagues when Congress passed tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, adding trillions to the deficit? Where were my deficit-concerned colleagues when President Bush took us into two wars without paying for either?

I find it hard to believe that after voting time and again to add trillions to the deficit, that the only solution they offer to create economic growth in this country is to end Medicare and to hand out more tax cuts to the wealthiest among us.

The Republican vision in this budget doesn't reflect the America that I grew up in, and their vision of an America that can't is not the country that I want my children to inherit.

Budgets are about choices, and this Republican budget chooses billionaires over seniors and oil subsidies over college dreams for our middle class.

The same Republican budget that replaces the Medicare guarantee and gives us ''coupon care'' that immediately and dramatically increases seniors' health care costs and that cuts college aid for over 9 million students and slashes investments in our K–12 schools, turns around and showers hundreds of thousands of dollars on millionaires and billionaires. You can't make this stuff up.

What's most astonishing to me about this budget is the absence of any talk about real Americans, those fighting to hold on to their jobs and their homes.

America has always been the land of opportunity, where those who work hard and play by the rules have a chance to succeed and to achieve the American Dream.

Instead of turning America into a can't-do country where you begin by dismantling Medicare and Medicaid and dismantling our programs to help our children trying to go to college and all of those institutions that we rely on, the Institutes of Health and all of those that do all the science research for us, we should recognize that this is still a great country.

We need to come together in this debate with the conviction that America's best days are yet to come.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this can't-do Republican budget and for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

Once again, the Republicans move a slash-and-burn budget that would turn Medicare into a private voucher system and force seniors to spend more than $6,000 out of pocket every additional year. It would gut Medicaid, education programs, medical research, and transportation among other things. You name it, they devastate it.

First, the Republican budget calls for a staggering $10 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations over 10 years. It would pay for it by closing unspecified tax loopholes, but this is a fraud. For loophole closing of this magnitude, the Republicans would have to get rid of all the tax breaks the middle class depends on, loopholes like the mortgage interest deduction, the tax exclusion for employer-sponsored health insurance, and charitable donations. This won't happen, which is why the Republicans won't name any of their loophole closings.

The Republican budget then proposes $5.3 trillion in non-defense discretionary spending cuts, beyond what was agreed to in last year's debt ceiling, $1.2 trillion beyond. It would slash $860 billion from Medicare and all to pay for tax cuts because it wouldn't balance the budget until 2040, because these cuts are to pay for the tax cuts for the wealthy.

For shame.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget for FY13 as offered by Mr. RYAN.

Last year, the Republicans moved a slash-and-burn budget proposal that would have eliminated Medicare and substituted for it a private voucher system, and would have implemented devastating cuts to Medicaid, education programs, medical research, and transportation, among other things You name it, they wanted to devastate it.

Now we turn to this year's Republican budget proposal and, as one famous New Yorker would say: It's déjà vu all over again.

First, the Republican budget calls for a staggering $10 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations over ten years. They claim to pay for this giveaway by closing unspecified tax loopholes. But this is a fraud. For loophole closing of this magnitude, the Republicans would have to get rid of all the tax breaks the middle class depends on—''loopholes'' like the mortgage interest deduction, tax exclusions for employer-sponsored health insurance, and charitable donations. This won't happen—which is why the Republicans won't name any of their ''loophole-closings.''

So this would make the budget deficit $10 trillion larger—which is why they do not anticipate balancing the budget until 2040. But they make devastating spending cuts—not to balance the budget, but to pay for their tax cuts for the wealthy. What priorities!

The Republican budget seeks even deeper spending cuts than last year's proposal. It proposes $5.3 trillion in non-defense discretionary spending cuts—$1.2 trillion (22 percent) beyond the cuts agreed to in last year's Debt Ceiling deal. More than 60 percent of these cuts would come on the backs of middle- and low-income families.

For example, the Republican budget would slash $860 billion (34 percent) from the Medicaid program while turning it into an unguaranteed block grant. These severe cuts would shift the cost burden to the states, who would have to decide between investing even more of their own money, cutting benefits, shifting the cost onto beneficiaries, doctors, and hospitals, throwing people out of the program, or all of these. The Urban Institute estimated that the Republican plan would result in between 14 and 27 million people being dropped from Medicaid by 2021.

Additionally, the Ryan budget would reduce food stamps by $134 billion, knocking 8 to 10 million people from the program and leaving them to go hungry. WIC, which provides nutritional assistance to women and children, would also be cut, taking food out of the mouths of 700,000 pregnant women, new moms and their kids. Over the next decade, nearly two million women and children would be left without access to critical food. What kind of cruel and heartless country do the Republicans want us to live in?

Seniors on Medicare don't fare much better. First, Republicans would raise the eligibility age to 67, leaving seniors aged 65 and 66 out in the cold. They would force seniors to go it alone in negotiating with private insurance companies for coverage. Seniors would receive vouchers to offset the cost of private insurance—vouchers whose value would increase much more slowly than the cost of buying medical insurance. CB0 estimates that within ten years seniors would have to pay $6,000 more out of pocket for medical care annually. All this, mind you, while promising to do away with all of the provisions in the Affordable Care Act, like medical ratio requirements, which actually help to stem the cost of private insurance.

Don't look to the Republican plan for investments in infrastructure, medical research, or education—primary or collegiate, for students or for teachers—because they are not there.

And the Republican budget would greatly increase unemployment. According to the Economic Policy Institute, Republican spending cuts would result in the loss of 1.3 million jobs next year and an additional 2.8 million jobs the year after that. That's 4.1 million jobs lost in just two years, thereby eviscerating all the jobs added to the economy in the last 23 months and then some.

Mr. Chair, the sheer gravity of the cuts proposed by the Republican budget is staggering and disastrous. While no budget is perfect, any of the Democratic proposals under consideration today is head and shoulders better for America, and for Americans, than the Ryan Budget Against America: Part Two.

While we may disagree on how to continue to support and grow our economy, let's stop using the working poor, the middle-class, women, kids, and seniors as pawns. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Ryan budget.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield myself the remaining time.

The debate we've had this afternoon is not whether we should reduce the deficit, whether we should reduce the debt, but how we do it, the choices that we make in reaching that goal.

We support what has been described as a balanced approach, the same approach taken by every bipartisan group that has looked at this challenge. That approach says, yes, we need to make cuts. But we should also cut special interest tax loopholes for the purpose of reducing the deficit. We should also ask folks at the very high end of the income ladder to go back to the same tax rates they were paying during the Clinton administration.

Our colleagues reject that balanced approach. I have not heard one of our Republican colleagues say that they're prepared to take one penny from closing a tax loophole, one penny from getting rid of an oil subsidy for the purpose of deficit reduction. When you do that, when you say we're not going to ask the wealthiest to share a greater responsibility, you have to take your budget cuts out on everyone and everything else. That's why they slashed the transportation funding next year by 46 percent, kicking the economy when it's down. That's why they end the Medicare guarantee for seniors. That's why they reopen the prescription-drug doughnut hole. That's why their budget cuts Medicaid by a third, by the year 2022, in the name of repairing the social safety net. That's not repairing the social safety net. That's blowing a hole in protections for the most vulnerable Americans.

That is not a choice the American people want to make. The American people would choose a balanced approach. They would not choose another round of tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income Americans, at the expense of important investments. They would reject that approach.

I urge my colleagues to reject that approach and adopt the balanced Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

When we confronted the 2008 economic crisis, which launched us into the worst recession since the Great Depression, which threw millions of people out of work, which lost trillions of dollars in wealth in retirement savings for millions of Americans, that crisis caught us by surprise. We didn't see it coming. Out of that came very ugly legislation that lots of us supported.

Mr. Chair, this one is the most predictable economic crises we've ever had, and we have a Senate that has chosen for 3 years in a row to just do nothing. We have a President who, for the fourth budget in a row, proposes to do nothing to fix it. In fact, he makes it worse.

Here is what we're trying to do. We're trying to go to the country and offer them a solution. We don't think the country is headed in the right direction right now because a debt crisis is coming. So we feel morally bound and actually legally bound because the Budget Act requires that we pass a budget to offer a solution and an alternative: fundamental tax reform to get job creators creating jobs; take away the special interest loopholes and tax shelters and treat everybody fairly; stop raising the tax rate on successful small businesses to 45 percent, like is going to happen in January, and instead keep their tax rates low so they can create jobs; control spending; reform our welfare system.

We believe the American idea is essentially an opportunity to decide if the safety net—and we believe in a safety net that is there to help people who cannot help themselves, and to be there to help people who are down on their luck get back on their feet. But we do not want to convert this safety net into a hammock that lulls able-bodied people into lives of dependency and complacency which drains them of their will and their intentions to make the most of their lives.

□ 1830

We believe in a system of upward mobility and opportunity. We believe when we see Medicare and Medicaid going bankrupt that we should fix that. Let's let the States innovate, create, and have good solutions that meet the needs of their populations by giving them more control over Medicaid. They run it already right now. They just have all these government rules and regulations from Washington.

Stop the rationing board from denying care to current seniors. Get rid of that, and replace it with a guarantee that current seniors get the promise made to them and future seniors actually have a program that's solvent. So instead of having 15 bureaucratic elites price-control their program, allow 50 million seniors in the future to choose which one they want the best. One-quarter of seniors already today pick among the private plans that meet their needs. We want to keep giving them the choices.

At the end of the day, it's about a choice of two futures: Do we want this path of debt, doubt, and decline where we have a debt crisis, where the people that get hurt first and the worst are those who need government the most—the poor, the people in the safety net, and the elderly who depend on Medicare—or are we going to get this debt under control and pay it off and give our children a better future?

At the end of the day, it's a philosophy. What the other side is doing and what the President is proposing is that elites in the bureaucracy who are unelected, they make the decisions. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that is paternalistic, it's arrogant, and it's condescending.

So the question really is: Who do you want to be in charge of your life, you or these cronies in government?

Do we want to keep taking money from job creators and from families and sending it to Washington so they can distribute it to their cronies, so they can distribute it to whoever has the clout, and so they can make all these decisions in our lives on health care, financial services, education, the environment, and energy? If we keep surrendering our liberties and our freedom and our dollars, we won't have the right to pursue happiness as we see happiness in our own lives.

The idea of this country is that our rights come from nature and God to us automatically before government. Our rights don't come from government. But the idea that's being perpetrated, the path the President is putting us on, is one where he and his elites in Washington know better. They define our rights for us. They regulate, ration, and redistribute them for us. Whatever you call that, Mr. Chairman, that is not the American idea.

We have a profound responsibility to look our children in the eye, like our parents did to us, and fix this country's problems so they can have a more prosperous future. We know, without a shadow of a doubt—it's irrefutable—the next generation is going to be worse off. We know that if we allow this debt crisis to continue, if we allow it to kick in—and the experts tell us it could be as little as 2 years away—everybody is going to get hurt and the economy is going to go down.

We have a moral obligation to do something about that. What we're saying is do it now, do it on our own terms, do it in a way where people can see the reforms that are necessary so they are gradual, and do it in a way so that we can keep the promises the government has made to people who have already retired who count on government the most.

At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, this is about choices. And we are going to give the country a choice of two futures so they can decide whether or not we want to maintain the American idea in this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control

30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the end of the day, the Republican budget developed by our Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, is a jobs bill. We know America faces an unemployment crisis today greater than at any time during the Depression. We know roughly 23 million Americans can't even find a full-time job. We know that while government spending has rebounded and how other factors have rebounded in this economy, what we know is that jobs haven't rebounded. In fact, there are fewer jobs in America today than when this President took his oath of office.

So we're going to talk about this budget and its impact on America's economy. The truth of the matter is, if you like the way our economy is going, if you think this is the best we can do, stick with the President's budget and stick with the Democrats' budget. It stays the course. But if you think we can do better for American hardworking taxpayers and jobseekers, there is a choice of two futures.

Mr. Chairman, it's a privilege to serve as the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the lead Republican for the House and Senate. I'd like to acknowledge the contributions that my fellow House Republicans, such as Dr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. MULVANEY make as members of the Joint Economic Committee.

We are here as a matter of law. Established in 1946 as the congressional counterpart to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Joint Economic Committee has provided timely insight on economic issues to the Congress for more than half a century. We helped lay the intellectual groundwork for the Kennedy tax cut in 1964, and its 1980 report plugging in the supply side established the credibility of supply-side economics and paved the way for the Reagan tax cuts in 1981. The Joint Economic Committee examines economic developments and evaluates economic ramifications of policies being considered by the Congress, such as this budget, and work by the JEC Republicans received national attention during the debate over President Obama's plan to nationalize health care in the 111th Congress.

Since the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the Joint Economic Committee has performed an important function in this, the annual budget process. Advising Members of Congress on the potential economic impact of the policies set forth in the President's budget and the budget resolution we consider today, it's for this purpose we come to the House floor this evening.

Well, let's begin our assessment of the House budget by discussing some very key economic principles.

Real growth in the economy, which is the foundation for creating jobs along Main Street for hardworking Americans, comes from the private sector and not from government. The Joint Economic Committee examined for the last 40 years the relationship between changes in government spending and jobs along Main Street and private payroll employment. And what's clear is that there is not a tight relationship; there's an inverse relationship.

As Federal Government spending grows, jobs along Main Street shrink. Likewise, when the Federal Government takes a smaller share of resources from Main Street, more hardworking taxpayers find jobs as payroll employment increases. And this chart shows—the blue being Federal Government spending and the red being jobs along Main Street—every time Washington grows, Main Street shrinks.

My colleagues across the aisle argue that Federal spending should increase when private job growth plummets, but even during periods of sustained increases in Federal spending and investments, jobs along Main Street have remained low or negative. And put simply, Federal spending doesn't create jobs. Only when Federal spending subsides do jobs grow.

Next, there's a very close economic relationship, though, between what we call private nonresidential fixed investment growth. What that means is, when businesses invest in building and software equipment technology, jobs along Main Street grow. This chart shows, again, since 1971, in blue the private investment, businesses software, equipment, and building; in red, job growth along Main Street. And it shows almost a nearly identical correlation.

So, in the end, growing jobs in America depends upon more investment in America, not Federal Government spending, more investment that creates those jobs. In spite of that evidence, 40 years of proven evidence, the White House, President Obama, and Congressional Democrats have only pushed us deeper and deeper into debt.

□ 1840

We have to remind ourselves that both the debt we hold to the public and our gross Federal debt are reaching new post-war levels. They've never been this high since World War II.

Publicly held Federal debt roughly doubled to nearly 70 percent of the size of our economy in just the 4 years leading up to 2011. The same can be said of the gross Federal debt, again, reaching 100 percent of our economy—dangerous levels: dangerous levels to the economy, dangerous levels to our credit rating, dangerous levels to our investment. According to the President's latest budget estimates, this gross debt isn't expected to go under 100 percent for years and years. In fact, he proposes a budget that never balances. The President proposes a budget that takes us deeper and deeper and deeper into debt and hangs an anchor around America's economy.

There is a better solution, and the model is right in front of us. All you have to do is compare President Obama's spending-driven approach to the economy and look at the last serious recession, that which President Reagan had to tackle. Despite bailouts and Cash for Clunkers and auto bailouts and stimulus and deficit-spending in the trillions of dollars, you can tell this recovery continues to struggle. A good comparison is the Reagan recovery because that recovery was fueled by Main Street, by private investment and free enterprise, just the opposite of President Obama and congressional Democrats.

The White House's current focus on massive increases in Federal spending, expanding government beyond imaginable levels to encourage growth has been a failure. Meanwhile, the smaller government, free-market approach utilized by the Reagan administration proved to be much more successful.

Looking at the comparisons between the two, at this same point in the recession, President Reagan's increase in jobs was up almost 10 percent; President Obama's is less than a third of that. The unemployment rate had dropped 3.5 percent at this point in the recovery under President Reagan. It's less than half of that under President Obama.

In average growth, how did the economy grow under the free-market, less-spending approach of President Reagan? It grew by 6 percent. President Obama's record is about a third of that.

These policies by this President and this Democrat Congress of the past 2 years, prior to Republican control, has failed. The point of the matter is government needs to get out of the way. We need to cut government spending. We need to hold the line and reform our terrible tax system. We need to free our small businesses from the oppressive level of regulation coming out of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, in a moment I'm going to talk about the tax reality. We're going to talk about how the current budget that we've living with today inflates our prices and damages real business. But at this time, I have a number of key speakers from the Joint Economic Committee in our conference that I want to get to.

So at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am afraid that our colleagues have made a slight mistake in naming their plan. This budget should be called the ''Road to Austerity'' because it is a plan that is most noteworthy for the rather harsh austerity it demands of the many and the lavish benefits it extends to the few.

It clearly envisions a rising tide of selective tax cuts that would lift all yachts, but leave most dinghies. Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few—millionaires and billionaires. That's their plan.

But before we get to the specifics of the plan tonight, it's important to examine where we are before we decide where we want to go.

Because of President Obama's economic policies, there are continuing signs of economic progress and recovery. For example, in the fourth quarter of 2011 and through the beginning of this year, there is fresh new data showing that the recovery is gaining strength. The economy has added more than 200,000 jobs for 3 straight months. As you can see from this chart, private sector employment has increased for 24 consecutive months; And during these past 24 months, the economy has added almost 4 million private sector jobs.

On this chart, the red bars are the Bush administration. It shows that in the closing days, the closing months, this country was losing over 700,000 jobs per month. The blue bars are the Obama administration. And you can see the steady, slow gains and the 24 months of gains of jobs in the private sector.

This chart is similar to one that was presented by Chairman Bernanke in his testimony before the Financial Services Committee in the Humphrey-Hawkins hearings. This is from his report. It shows the low, deep area we were in when President Obama took office, losing so many jobs, and because of his policies, the steady gain and the continuing gain we hope to see.

Actions taken by the President and Congress, including passage of the Recovery Act and recent legislation to continue Federal Unemployment Insurance and extend the payroll tax cut through 2012, have played an important role in driving this economic recovery and private job gain.

Few would disagree, however, that to reach this point has taken longer than we would have liked. It has required fiscal interventions to sustain and strengthen the economy and to support those harmed by the Great Recession. And it has required a variety of creative and effective approaches from the Federal Reserve to ease monetary policy and boost growth.

I would also like to show the chart on unemployment. It shows that the unemployment rate has fallen significantly, from 9.1 percent last August to 8.3 percent in February, which is well below the peak of 10 percent reached in October 2009. So, again, these are positive signs under the Obama administration.

Still, there are far too many Americans hurting. The reality is that we have a long way to go to regain the ground that we lost during the Great Recession: 12.8 million Americans remain unemployed, and more than four out of 10 unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months. The share of those unemployed and out of work for more than 6 months has been greater than 40 percent since December of 2009, a period of time that has been unprecedented.

Clearly, cutting further into the unemployment rate and bringing down the rate of long-term unemployed must be continuing priorities of this Congress. I can say that Democrats will not be satisfied until every American who wants a job can get a job. So while we have made some economic progress, there are many challenges ahead.

While GDP has grown for 10 straight quarters, GDP growth in the first quarter of 2012 is projected to slow to an annual rate of just 1.9 percent. This is far from robust economic growth. The European community's economic weakness may present new headwinds in the months ahead. And the recent spike in U.S. oil and gas prices leaves consumers with fewer dollars in their wallets for other purchases, putting new pressure on the recovery.

Clearly, we need Congress to stay vigilant on the fiscal side. Part of this fiscal vigilance is rejecting austerity plans and short-sighted budget cuts that will jeopardize the recovery while harming the most vulnerable among us, including low-income Americans and senior citizens.

□ 1850

The reality is that the majority's Ryan budget harms those who need help and doles out tax breaks and benefits to those who don't. Let me be as clear as I possibly can. The Ryan budget, if it were passed by this House, would risk our recovery.

The majority's budget resolution for 2013, the Ryan budget, abandons the economic recovery, contains policies that ship American jobs overseas, and harms our Nation's economic competitiveness. And by slashing programs that low-income and elderly Americans count on, while cutting taxes for corporations and the wealthiest individuals, the Ryan budget provides the latest, clearest example of Republican economic priorities.

Just like last year, the Ryan budget ends the Medicare guarantee, shifts the burden of rising health care costs onto seniors, and shreds our Nation's social safety net. These are bad choices for America.

The Ryan budget extends the Bush tax cuts and lowers the current top tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, giving millionaires and billionaires a 10 percentage-point tax cut.

Instead of asking the wealthiest Americans to do what they can to help restore fiscal responsibility and preserve vital services, Republicans would choose to slash support for tuition assistance and other services in order to pay for tax cuts that provide a huge benefit to millionaires and hurt America's working middle class.

The Ryan budget includes the latest attempt to end Medicare as we know it. Instead of strengthening Medicare, Ryan's plan would replace Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher for Medicare or private insurance, creating higher costs for seniors and unraveling the traditional Medicare program.

Initial analysis shows that the plan would cut future spending by $5,900 per senior, shifting costs to seniors and diminishing their access to quality care. Republicans continue to propose ideas to end Medicare, even though 70 percent of Americans support keeping the program as it is.

The Ryan budget would strip away health care benefits for millions of American families. By repealing the Affordable Care Act, Chairman RYAN's plan would eliminate benefits that are providing stable and secure care for millions of Americans and go back to the days when insurance companies would deny coverage or jack-up prices, or just refuse coverage because of preexisting conditions whenever, and however, they pleased.

The Republican budget would get rid of benefits Americans are already receiving, such as the following:

Free preventive health services for 32 million seniors; $3.2 billion in prescription drug savings for 5.1 million seniors by reopening the doughnut hole; reducing drug coverage; preventive services like mammograms, cervical cancer screening, and contraception for over 20 million women; coverage for 2.5 million young Americans who have already gained coverage on their parents' insurance plans; protections from insurance companies canceling coverage when people get sick; and denying coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

And the Ryan budget also eliminates benefits slated to help Americans in the coming 2 years, such as access to stable and secure care for 32 million Americans; protections against being discriminated against due to gender or preexisting conditions; or facing limits on coverage for over 105 million Americans.

Chairman RYAN's budget does something else. It breaks the agreement made last year to reduce the deficit, backing out of the bipartisan deal Republicans and Democrats made on government spending. Many will recall last year, in order to avert an unprecedented national default, Democrats and Republicans passed the Budget Control Act.

The Ryan budget breaks that agreement, that bipartisan agreement, by slashing government services by $19 billion more than was agreed to in the Budget Control Act. Republicans would break their word on spending and reduce services and investments, all while slashing tax rates for millionaires and billionaires.

The Ryan budget block-grants Medicaid, slashing $810 billion from the program, jeopardizing nursing home care for seniors, and shifting costs to States.

Chairman RYAN's plan reaffirms the Republican call to end Medicaid as a safety net, jeopardizing vital services that seniors depend on, like nursing home care and home health care aides, and shifts the burden of rising health care costs to cash-strapped States.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, these dramatic reductions in spending ''might involve reduced eligibility coverage of fewer services, lower payments to providers, or increased cost-sharing by beneficiaries, all of which would reduce access to care.''

The Ryan budget increases the burden on low-income Americans. The Republican budget block-grants and slashes funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by almost $123 billion over 10 years, jeopardizing economic security for millions of Americans.

The Ryan budget would also just pull the plug on America's clean-energy industries. Instead of moving toward a clean economy and reducing dependence on fossil fuels, Chairman RYAN's plan pulls the plug on support for clean-energy technology and simply calls for opening more land to drilling, even though American oil production is at its highest level since 2003, and the oil and gas industry is using less than one-third of the 75 million acres of land offered for development. And it continues the subsidies to the oil industry.

This plan would pull Americans out of the race to create well-paying new jobs and dominate the growing global market for clean-energy technology.

The alternative, of course, is the Democratic plan, which takes a totally different approach, a balanced approach of shared sacrifice that meets the Nation's need to invest in the future, keeps our country strong, and preserves Medicare and our social safety net, while continuing tax relief for working families.

For me, the choice is easy, not hard. I urge you to join me in supporting the Democratic plan, supporting Medicare, supporting working families, supporting the middle class, and supporting the firm belief that the American Dream is alive and well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), one of the key new members of the Joint Economic Committee who understands you can't tax your way back to a strong economy or to a balanced budget.

Mr. DUFFY. To be clear, we owe over $15 trillion in national debt. This year we're going to borrow $1.3 trillion and a couple of years before that. Every year we've borrowed $1 trillion.

And I hear my friends across the aisle talk about a balanced approach. I believe the American people want a balanced budget. I think we need to be clear on what the Democrat proposals are. If you look at what my friends across the aisle have proposed in regard to a budget, it never balances. There are deficits and debt as far as the eye can see.

The President's budget, there are debts and deficits as far as the eye can see. It never balances.

Then we look at the Democrat-controlled Senate. For 3 years they haven't passed a budget.

And so I think the American people want honesty. They want to make sure that the Democrats are honest with regard to how much debt we're going to pass off to our next generation.

□ 1700

They want us to be honest with regard to how much debt the Democrats want the Chinese to buy from America. I think they want us to be honest in regard to tax rates that, as of April 1, America is going to have the highest tax rate in the industrialized world. My Democrat friends across the aisle, they want to raise taxes even further. So when a business is looking at where it's going to invest, is it going to be in America or somewhere else? Or if you're looking at investing in America or somewhere else, they look at tax rates.

When we talk about shipping jobs overseas, it's these tax policies from my friends across the aisle that ship my jobs in Wisconsin overseas.

They talk about fairness and wanting to balance the budget on a fair playing field. Let's take a look at this chart. Today, the two top tax rates are 33 and 35 percent. If you want to get the deficit down to 3 percent of the economy, you have to raise those top tax rates to 72 and 77 percent. If you want to get it down to 2 percent of debt to the size of our economy, you have to raise the top tax rate to 86 and 91 percent.

The bottom line is, if you wanted to pay off the debt with the current spending agenda of the Democrats, you could never do it by taxing. You could take all of the wealth, all of the income of those top tax earners, and you would never balance the budget.

Americans want you to be honest in regard to the fallacy that you can tax your way out of these debts and deficits.

I think America wants you to be honest in regard to your plan for Medicare, the plan that says you want to take a half a trillion dollars out of Medicare and use it for some other group. Taking seniors' money that they have invested in that plan for a lifetime, take a half a trillion out and use it for another group of people; that's unconscionable.

But moreover, you want to set up a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats who are going to ration our seniors' care, a board that's going to systematically reduce reimbursements to doctors, hospitals, and clinics, and, in essence, will impact the access and quality of care, not of some future generations of seniors, but of today's seniors.

So when we talk about taking care of our seniors, let's have a plan that truly takes care of our seniors, which is the House plan.

I hear about a guaranteed benefit that the Democrats talk about for our seniors. There is no guaranteed benefit for our seniors. They're rationing it down to nothing.

I think it's important we talk about a bold plan, bold leadership that's going to resolve the problems that we face in this country; a plan that is going to put us on a path of sustainability, that will balance our budget, that will pay off our debt; a plan that implements pro-growth policies so our economy can expand.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUFFY. A plan that will put us on a pro-growth path, but also a plan that will preserve and protect Medicare and save it for future generations.

I would ask my friends across the aisle to stop pandering but to join us in bold leadership, and I would submit that their children and grandchildren, some not yet born, would applaud their bold leadership to save our country from this massive debt that will be their future if we don't act.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, a member of the Budget Committee, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add a few words. Some of these kinds of issues have been talked about all day or all afternoon, but I felt compelled to rise again to talk about what really is at stake here, and what is truly a sharp contrast between the Republican budget and the Democratic budget alternative.

Our budgets as a Federal budget should reflect our priorities and values as a Nation. Our Democratic budget moves America forward by building for the future, by investing in innovation, in education, in energy with confidence and expectation about the opportunities that are available to us in this country.

But it also ensures that we keep our promises to America's seniors by protecting and strengthening Medicare.

The Republican plan for America moves our Nation backward and harms our economic competitiveness now and into the future by choosing sustained tax cuts for millionaires over small businesses and jobs for the middle class, by choosing tax breaks for our biggest companies rather than investments in our future economic growth.

Their vision is one in which college becomes more expensive for millions of Americans, where investments in innovation and research are slashed and we stop being the leaders in the world on bioscience and energy. It abandons seniors in their most vulnerable years.

Rather than balancing the budget by shifting costs to Medicare beneficiaries, the Democratic budget reduces the rate of growth in health care spending through initiatives that will increase our value and efficiency in our health care system. It will contain costs for Medicare and for all Americans.

Millions of seniors rely on Medicare every day for their life-saving medications, treatments, and doctor visits. We cannot abandon our obligation to our seniors, and the Democratic budget does not.

The Democratic budget takes a balanced approach to meeting our Nation's fiscal challenges. It makes targeted investments needed to spur economic growth, and, yes, it preserves the Medicare guarantee and protects tax relief for middle class families—a high priority for us, one that is much less, if a priority at all, for the Republican budget.

Our budget tackles the Federal deficit by reducing the Federal deficit as a share of GDP by more than 8 percent so that it is 2.7 percent of GDP within 10 years. We make some hard choices about how we cut spending, but our budget is a commitment to cut spending by over $2 trillion.

So it reduces the deficit responsibly and fairly. It protects our seniors and our middle class, and it does not ask either our seniors or the middle class to shoulder our fiscal challenges alone.

We have a choice to make, and we will be making it this evening and tomorrow as we decide which budget is better for the America that we dream about, that we expect, and that we work for.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for a responsible budget that, yes, makes spending cuts and also makes smart investments; that grows our economy, but also meets our obligations; that respects our values and who we are as Americans. It creates opportunities, and it is fair to America.

I suggest that we vote ''yes'' for the Democratic budget that protects America and our values and grows our economy.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), who serves on an important Small Business Committee and who is a nurse and understands our health care challenges in America.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the chairman for allowing me to be here tonight to help in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, the President's economic agenda has failed the American people. The President's economic agenda has failed our job creators, our seniors, and future generations.

The President's policies have failed and are making the economy worse. The President's budget calls for more failed attempts to tax, spend, borrow, and bail out our way to job creation.

I'd like to read a quote from a third party that addresses this issue. Bernie Marcus, former chairman and CEO of Home Depot:

> If we don't lower spending, and if we don't deal with paying down the debt, we are going to have to raise taxes. Even brain-dead economists understand that when you raise taxes, you cost jobs.

□ 1910

Because the President cannot stand on his record, he has regrettably turned to the politics of envy and division. There is nothing fair about making our children and our grandchildren pay the bills for what the President's own fiscal commission cochairs called ''the most predictable economic crisis in our history.''

I have a couple of more quotes, and these aren't from conservative publications, mind you.

USA Today: ''Obama's budget plan leaves debt bomb ticking.''

The Boston Herald:

> President Barack Obama has apparently decided that he is not going to be part of the solution to the Nation's enormous deficit, which would make him, yes, part of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, our friends across the aisle continuously discuss the issue of Medicare, which we know is one of the growing problems when we're dealing with the debt. Our Democrat friends continue to say that Republicans are cutting Medicare and are changing it as we know it. Yet, in ObamaCare, they cut a half a trillion dollars out of Medicare.

I have a quote from the Congressional Budget Office as well, and my friend across the aisle had one a few moments ago. This quote is from 12/19/09, and reads that the government takeover of health care ''could reduce access to care or diminish the quality of care.''

I also have a quote from the Government Accountability Office: ''Medicare remains on a path that is fiscally unsustainable over the long term.''

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, House Republicans are going to pass a jobs bill. We are going to pass a budget. This budget includes fundamental pro-growth tax reform and eliminating corporate loopholes and subsidies in order to help create jobs. It addresses the real drivers of our debt, saving our social safety net programs from going bankrupt, and it calls for the repeal of the government takeover of health care and other job-destroying spending.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the House budget bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. I inquire of the Chair as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Unfortunately, this is one of the most partisan weeks in Washington as each side presents its own budget. I urge Members to weigh these budgets very carefully. Unfortunately, we have very little time to do so. The entire debate for the Republican and Democrat budgets is some 4 hours. There will be many alternative budgets presented.

The one that I am most interested in, the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed budget, will come up later tonight, which is a big schedule change since it hadn't been expected until tomorrow. We will have a total of 10 minutes to explain the only bipartisan budget that will be offered. There are six or seven budgets being offered, but there is only one that is bipartisan. There are many excellent features in the Democratic budget and in the Republican budget, but there is only one that has the support of folks on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that Members choose carefully even in this, the most partisan of weeks, because it's almost a David versus Goliath situation when you have 10 minutes versus 4 hours. I hope that Members will look at the details of these budgets and will realize that hidden in the details are lots of massive changes to lots of massive programs. Yet, if we don't let ideology control, if we look at the basics and realize that America does have a deficit and debt problem, as the White House acknowledges and as our Republican friends acknowledge, if we respect each other and understand that we have to have real revenues and entitlement reform, there is still really only one plan that offers both. I did not originate it, but I'm thankful that Simpson and Bowles, with their report of a year and a half ago, introduced such a plan. Tonight, later in the debate, in an hour or two, Members will have the first opportunity in either the House or the Senate to consider that.

So these are very important issues that we're facing. I wish it were not a David and Goliath sort of situation. It's almost like David versus two Goliaths, because the institutional infrastructure in Washington supporting either the Republican budget or the Democratic budget is massive.

I think that once you look at the fundamentals, you see that there has got to be a way in which Americans can work together. The folks I hear from back home—and I assume it's true in every State—want us to stop the partisan bickering and want to us work together. I am thankful that our Republican friends allowed the Simpson-Bowles bipartisan budget to be considered, but for Members to only have 10 minutes of debate to consider it is going to be very difficult.

So I'm hopeful that Members, as they're sitting in their offices tonight, as they're interrupting their dinners, as they're contemplating these issues, will focus not only on the important Joint Economic Committee issues that have been raised by both sides this evening but that they will also focus on the details of the budgets they're about to vote on.

We had anticipated that the vote on the Simpson-Bowles alternative would be tomorrow morning, which is what we had been told, but an hour or so ago, they suddenly had a change of plans. We feel that we're gaining momentum, and I think that's evidenced by the fact that most folks of the interest groups in Washington are gearing up to either support us or to oppose us, so I think that Members should weigh their decisions tonight very carefully.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a key member of the Joint Economic Committee and of the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the most knowledgeable on health care, a physician who has delivered more than 3,000 babies, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

A lot of people have asked, if you're going to do a Republican budget, why do you even involve yourself in the President's new health care law? They've asked, Why is it necessary for the Republican budget to repeal the President's health care law and advance bipartisan solutions that take power away from the government and give it back to the people?

The Joint Economic Committee prepared a chart dealing with the Affordable Care Act some 2 years ago, and it's an involved chart. You look at it and—it needs to be right side up, of course. But do you know what? It doesn't really matter. It makes just as much sense upside down. The only reason I wanted to turn it over is because, when you look at this thing, instead of the patient being at the center of all of this, the patient is way down here at the bottom. This chart was prepared, again, 2 years ago by the committee staff of the Joint Economic Committee, and this is precisely the reason why the Affordable Care Act has to be pulled up by the roots in order for us to get any semblance of economic sanity in this country.

Ignore the fact for a moment that this thing busts the bank. Ignore the fact that this is a drain on the Federal Treasury unlike anything we've ever seen before. The bottom line is that this just does not work.

Now, I spent yesterday at the Supreme Court, and I got to hear the oral arguments before the Supreme Court. It was astonishing to hear the arguments put forward as to why we had to take over one-sixth of the economy and why we had to expand government power in a way that's really going to fundamentally redefine the relationship of the government with the American people.

The reason was, well, the uninsured cost us so much money. I've got to tell you something—that's nonsense. The uninsured, yes, may cost a little bit at the margin of the total health care system, but what's the real cost driver of health care in this country? What's the real reason that health insurance is going inexorably up and up and up? It is because the Federal Government does not pay its freight for Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP, and it is the cross-subsidization from the private sector to fill that hole by the public sector that causes the cost of insurance to go up so much.

I was astounded that this argument was not made before the Supreme Court. I was concerned that they might be arguing from false premises. Regardless, what is the solution then to fixing this problem of the health care costs going up? We're going to put a subsidy out there for the middle class in the exchanges. Well, that will help.

Then the worst part is we're going to double Medicaid. Medicaid is the problem. Medicaid is the reason this cost is going up inexorably year over year over year. What was the President's solution? What was Speaker PELOSI's solution? Let's double Medicaid in this country, and see if that won't fix the problem. Will it fix the problem? I submit it will not.

You ask yourself, How could the law be so convoluted as shown on this graph? The reason is, if you look at the language that wrote that graph, this is not two copies of the law; this is one copy of the law in two volumes. How was it so badly done? You need do nothing more than to look at the title page of H.R. 3590 from December 24, 2009, in the Senate of the United States.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1920

Mr. BURGESS. Christmas Eve, December 24, 2009, Resolved, that the bill from the House of Representatives H.R. 3590 entitled, An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time home buyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Well, wait a minute. That doesn't sound like a health care law. How did it become a health care law? It's called an amendment. An amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the remaining 2,700 pages.

I submit to you, this thing was flawed from start to finish. It must be struck out by the roots; otherwise, fiscal sanity cannot be restored back it to this country.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlelady, and I applaud her work on the Joint Economic Committee.

I come this evening to suggest that it would, indeed, be cheaper for our country if we want to subordinate this great Nation to other nations in this world. If we want to educate less of our children, if we want to invest less in innovation, if we want to do less in terms of providing for the well-being of our country, we could try to operate on the cheap.

I don't think it's worthy of our House to consider a budget that would cut off America's global leadership position. As we see China, India, other countries, the European Union rising to become more and more economic competitors to the United States, this debate between Democrats and Republicans is much too small for this body. We need to be thinking about our country, thinking about the future of our country and its position in the world.

No one can intellectually argue that somehow it would be better for our Nation to educate less of our children, to have less scientists or engineers or to invest less in manufacturing and innovation. So I would ask the majority this evening, after we get finished with this part of the process, that we try to come together, to think about not our party but positioning our country for future greatness.

We have a grand legacy as a Nation, and for us to come here and to say, well, the way we're going to solve this problem is we're just going to cut, cut, and cut—this is a budget that cuts trillions but doesn't get the budget in balance for the next 30 years. Really, they are using the fiscal circumstances of the country to go after programs that they never supported anyway.

This is not a worthy proposition for our House. I am prepared to support the Democratic budget. I am prepared to support Simpson-Bowles. I'm prepared to support raising additional revenue. The majority of our country believes that we should have a balanced approach, that is, we should cut programs we don't need and we should raise the revenues we do need.

We're at a 60-year low in tax rates, and the young lady who spoke on the other side said earlier that any economist will tell you that by raising taxes you will lose jobs. Well, let me tell you what the facts are:

When, under the Clinton administration we raised taxes, we invested in education, we invested in clean energy, we created close to 23 million new jobs in this country, and every sector of our society improved. Yes, the rich got richer, but every other group of Americans also did better. Those are the facts. Facts are stubborn things.

I hope that, as a Congress, we can rise to meet the needs of this great Nation.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), again, another key freshman member of the Joint Economic Committee and also a member of the Budget Committee who understands, again, what it takes to get this terribly sluggish economy back on track.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for the opportunity.

There is so much we could talk about here tonight, and it is unfortunate we only have a few minutes to talk about each of these budgets. But one of the things that I heard the gentlelady from New York mention earlier in her presentation was that the budget that we've offered as the Republican Party is noteworthy mostly for its austerity.

I would disagree with that. I think it's noteworthy mostly for the fact that it balances. It balances. It does something the President's budget does not do. It does something that I would expect the Democrat offering later on this evening does not do. It balances.

It's a word that our colleagues across the aisle, Mr. Chairman, like to use from time to time. They want an approach that balances. I used to think that the word ''balance'' would actually mean that the budget would balance. They would have us believe that what it really means is they want to maybe sort of raise taxes and sort of cut spending.

The truth of the matter is, though, that every single budget that they've offered has only increased taxes and increased spending. That's true of the President's budget, which we'll be taking up later this evening. I imagine it's true of Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, which we will be taking up later this evening.

And I think it's important to look at what would actually work. We're not the first country to go through this situation. In fact, if you look at other countries that have had debt crises like we are facing now, which you can see that some of them have managed to get out of it, and they have managed to get out of it mostly by cutting spending. In fact, a ratio of roughly seven-to-one on spending cuts versus tax increases is what actually works. And you can do better than this. You can point to other countries that have managed to save themselves without raising taxes by a single penny. You cannot point to a single country that has done it by raising taxes on even a one-to-one basis, as we'll take up tonight with Simpson-Bowles.

But again, the President's budget, the Democrat budget doesn't even come close to this. We couldn't even put it on the graph because it both increases taxes and increases spending, not even coming close to what has worked in every other developed nation that has tried to do exactly what we are trying to do with our budget tonight.

Look, I spend a lot of time back home, and I know that folks back home might be willing, under certain circumstances, to pay more taxes. They might do that, for example, if they could trust us not to waste the money. They might be willing to do that if they could trust us to actually put the money towards the debt and deficits. But we don't do that. What have we always given them, mostly from my colleagues across the aisle but also from my party in past years? New spending now and new waste now in exchange for a promise of spending reductions someplace down the road that never come.

I think it's time for us to acknowledge that our colleagues are trying to sell us a definition of the word ''balance'' that doesn't make any sense. It's time for us to reclaim the definition of that word and say, look, we are the ones offering a balanced budget. We are the ones who are offering a balanced approach. We are the ones that are offering a way to pay off the debt.

I think it's a fair question to ask: The money that we borrowed yesterday, do we ever really intend to pay it back?

The Ryan budget allows us a way to do that. The GOP budget allows us a way to do that. The President's budget never moves to surplus.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman from South Carolina an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MULVANEY. The President's budget never goes to surplus. There is no plan offered by the Democrats to actually pay back the money that we are borrowing.

It's time to change the word back to what it really means, which is spending less than we take in. And it's the Republican budget that offers that this evening.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to my colleague from the other side of the aisle who objected to my calling the Republican plan, which is called the Road to Prosperity—when I said that it actually should be called the Road to Austerity. On the negative side of the Republican plan, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Republican austerity plan will destroy 4.1 million jobs through 2014. But at the same time, the Republican budget makes tax cuts for the most fortunate few permanent, while those making over $1 million per year will get an average tax cut of at least $150,000, and tax breaks for Big Oil will be preserved. That's their plan.

The alternative, of course, is the Democratic budget plan, which takes a totally different approach, a balanced approach that meets the Nation's need to invest in the future while preserving Medicare and our social safety nets and supporting the firm belief that the American Dream is alive and well by investing in the future of our children and our Nation.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership tonight.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman.

I want to close where the gentlelady began, which is on the economy and on jobs.

As this chart shows, when President Obama was sworn in, we were losing over 800,000 jobs a month. But because of actions taken by the President and the Congress and because of the tenacity of the American people and small businesses, we were able to stop the free fall and begin to climb out of that hole.

□ 1930

We are now at 24 consecutive months of positive private sector job growth. There were close to 4 million jobs created in that period. We need to sustain that recovery, not put the brakes on it.

The Republican proposal unfortunately puts the brakes on it. I'll give you just one example. Next year they would cut our investment in transportation in their budget by 46 percent when we have about 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry. That's putting the brakes on.

We hear from our colleagues that the only way to deal with the budget deficits is to cut, cut, cut. We propose a balanced approach. We do ask that we close some of those tax loopholes. We do ask that folks making a million dollars a year go back to paying the rates that they were in the Clinton administration.

Let's see what happened in the economy back then. What this shows is during the Clinton years, 20.8 million jobs were created. After President Bush took office, they lowered the tax rates. There was a net of 653,000 jobs lost. By the way, in 2001, just before the tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the wealthy, that was the last time we balanced the budget. We balanced the budget, and we had great job growth. That's why we propose a balanced approach.

The issue here is not whether we reduce the deficit, not whether we reduce the debt. It's how. Yes, we have to make spending cuts. I hear colleagues on the Republican side coming down here and saying you can't do this all on the revenue side. We get that. But you know what? If you do it without asking the folks at the very top to pay a penny, by closing loopholes and getting rid of tax breaks, what does it mean? It means everybody else pays the consequences.

Those decisions to support the wealthy and not ask for shared responsibility come at the expense of our seniors and you end the Medicare guarantee and slash Medicaid by $800 billion. It comes at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, because not only are you locking in the Bush tax cuts for the folks at the top, you're dropping the top rate from 35 percent to 25 percent. That's another over-$200,000 tax break to people making a million dollars a year.

You say you're going to pay for it. You know how it's going to happen? It's going to happen by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans. That's how you're going to finance it. I've not seen a proposal. Show me a piece of paper that says it won't be taken out on middle-income taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, there's a better approach than the Republican approach. It's the balanced approach. It's the approach supported by bipartisan groups, and it's the approach that we will propose in our amendment.

I again thank the gentlelady and thank the Chairman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

President Obama made two key promises to the American public. The first was that he would reduce the deficit by half in his first term of office. The second is that he would fix this broken economy in 3 years.

Let's take a close look at those promises, looking first at the economy. This is hard to believe—and I hope those at home are sitting down—but after all of the bailouts, after all the stimulus, after all the Cash for Clunkers, the deficit spending, the housing bailout, everything the President wished for and got in increased spending, we have fewer Americans working today than when this President took office. Think about it: there are fewer Americans working after all the President's economic policies have gone full bore. It's failed the American public in such a way that there are fewer people working today than when this President took the oath of office.

Look at the stimulus. This chart shows he promised the American public if you'll just borrow and spend nearly a trillion dollars of interest, our economy will recover. In fact, he promised right now our unemployment rate would be around 6 percent. It's far above that at nearly 8½ percent. But that doesn't tell the whole picture because so many Americans have given up hope and so many Americans don't even look for a job anymore. They've just dropped out. We have the fewest people in the workforce in almost three decades. They've just given up that much. Our unemployment rate is really nearly 16 percent. It's a little above it, as a matter of fact.

This is an unemployment crisis. The President's policies—no question, he inherited a poor economy, to say the least. His policies have failed. He's made it worse for about 23 million Americans who can't even find a full-time job these days.

If you want more of the same, stick with the President's budget, stick with the Democrats' budget. They deliver more of the same in an economy that is struggling like it hasn't since the Depression, and millions of Americans just can't find work no matter how hard they try.

The President promised he would reduce the deficit and cut it in half in his first term. He should have been able to do that. Instead, he has increased it by almost half. This is the fourth trillion-dollar deficit in a row.

He proposes to spend so that we're the largest government in American history, larger even than World War II when they dropped everything to win the war. He wants a government bigger than that and deficits that go as far as the eye can see.

Republicans believe we ought to have a choice of futures. When you look at the debt that's being piled on America in the future, let me put that in real terms. We have two young boys, and one is in third grade and one is in seventh. They make our family a joy. I think about what all this means to them, and you may be thinking about it for your kids or your grandkids. All that red ink this President has piled up and the future of America with this debt, today a baby born in America, their fair share of the debt is about $47,000. A baby born today owes Uncle Sam a new Lexus.

If we don't change our ways by the time they're 13, they'll owe Uncle Sam a second Lexus. By the time they're 22 when they've finished college and they're getting ready to start their life, they'll owe Uncle Sam a third Lexus.

The good news is young people don't actually buy luxury sedans for the Federal Government, but they pay the price another way. For all that debt, they pay the price in a sluggish economy, in higher taxes, in higher interest rates. So that young person starting their life after all that schooling and pursuing their dreams in America, they'll have a harder time finding jobs—there will be fewer of them—and they'll keep less in their paycheck as a result of this. That's the future if we stay the course with this President and Democrats in Congress.

Republicans believe there is a better future for America. The Republican budget does just that. It restores a healthy economy for America in a commonsense way. It gets our financial house in order. It starts limiting this out-of-control spending. It starts to take away all the waste and abuse, sunsetting obsolete Agencies, stopping this wasteful spending from stem to stern in the Federal budget. It starts to tighten the Federal Government's belt and budget.

In addition to putting our financial house in order, it shrinks the size of government. It makes it affordable again for America. Not only do we balance the budget; the goal of the Republican budget is to pay off our debt.

Think about it: our goal is not to just break even again. It's to start to whittle down and pay off those huge amounts of debt that we owe to so many in this world. It tackles important issues like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It preserves them for every generation once and for all.

Last year, America had to borrow $142 billion from China and other foreign investors just to pay Social Security for our seniors. We know Medicare goes bankrupt in 12 years unless we act. If we don't act today, Medicare ends itself as we know it. It ends itself.

Republicans have a commonsense proposal to preserve those important programs, to make them sustainable for every generation; and we do it without raising taxes.

We know you can't take more from people and hope to grow the economy. We know that Washington ought to tighten its belt before we ask hard-working taxpayers to tighten theirs. We know that taxing professionals and small businesses, taxing our local energy companies who manufacture here in the United States, we know that taxing companies that are creating jobs in America is the wrong way to go.

□ 1940

We're going to offer, and are offering, not just a choice of two futures; we're offering some hope to a country that despairs it will ever see a balanced budget again. We're offering hope to a country that right now has a second-rate economy and that some parts of the world make fun of, frankly. We're going to offer hope to businesses who want to compete again both in their community and around the world because today what they tell us is they're not adding jobs. With this debt hanging over us, with all the talk of new taxes and new regulation, they're not adding those jobs. Why would they?

The Republican budget makes sure that we don't balance our budget on the backs of America's small businesses. We know the problem isn't that government doesn't take more of what you earn; the problem is that the Federal Government spends too much. We offer a Path to Prosperity to America. It's the only responsible budget that will be offered to this debate. I wish I could say the Senate will take it up; but for 3 years, they've refused to give a budget to the American people.

We're going to change the trajectory of America, we're going to change the future of America, and we're going to give hope back by passing the Republican budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget. This budget makes the wrong choices. We must enact a plan to steadily reduce our deficits and debts, but we must do so in a responsible way.

This Republican budget is irresponsible. It provides tax breaks to millionaires, while ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting more costs to seniors. It slashes health insurance for the working disabled, gutting the program that provides the care they need to stay working. It shifts hundreds of billions in costs on to the States—the same States that are struggling to balance their budgets.

It transfers tens of billions in health care costs on to the backs of the frail elderly in nursing homes and parents with children. And it takes away the guarantee of affordable health coverage—a right that everyone should enjoy—and leaves millions more uninsured.

My Republican colleagues fail to understand that simply cutting the Federal commitment to health care, as they propose, doesn't make the need go away—it just shifts the problem somewhere else. Rather than responsibly address the issue of rising health care costs as the Democrats did in the Affordable Care Act—House Republicans would repeal that bill and leave American families without any protections from insurance company abuses.

The Republican budget doesn't fix our health care problems. To pay for tax breaks for millionaires, it cuts hundreds of billions of dollars from Medicare and Medicaid and shifts costs to seniors . . . to people with disabilities . . . and to families with children.

Under the Republican budget, the Medicaid program would be gutted. Their budget cuts more than $1.7 trillion out of the program over the next ten years and turns it into a block grant.

This is deeply misguided. Medicaid serves the poorest children, pregnant women, elderly in nursing homes, and those needing services to live in the community and more. By 2050, when the baby boom generation will be retired and in need of long term care, Medicaid would be cut 75 percent according to the Congressional Budget Office. It's a great talking point if you want to appeal to the Tea Party, but a horrible policy if you really care about America's health.

And of course, every Federal dollar cut from Medicaid means almost $2 cut from the State economy. As a result, the Republican plan would ultimately sap nearly $3.4 trillion in health care spending out of state and local economies, causing a significant loss in health care jobs and investments.

The Republican budget makes severe cuts to Medicare, ending the program as we know it. For nearly five decades, Medicare has provided a lifeline for tens of millions of seniors and people with disabilities. Seniors rely on Medicare's affordability, and they depend on its guaranteed benefits. They cherish their ability to pick their own doctors, and they know that their doctors will treat them without interference from insurance bureaucrats. But the Republican plan would undo these protections. They would turn Medicare into a voucher that is virtually guaranteed to not keep pace with rising health care costs—leaving seniors holding the bag.

The adverse impacts on seniors would be immediate. The Republican plan would repeal access to free preventive services, increase prices for prescription drugs in the donut hole, and undo the other improvements to Medicare that were part of the Affordable Care Act.

The proposed cuts wouldn't just hurt Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP. This budget slashes the level of discretionary spending for many critical health programs, including prevention and wellness, health professions training, community health centers, biomedical research, and oversight of food, drugs and medical devices.

These programs—and many others—would face severe cuts if the limit for appropriated programs is reduced below the level agreed to—on a bipartisan basis—less than a year ago.

I want to be clear. This isn't a proposal that would affect people years from now. It will have very real effects immediately. This budget would irreparably harm the basic fabric of our Nation's health care system. It is bad medicine. There is a better way to rein in our deficit. I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican plan.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the Republican Budget. This budget is another giveaway to the wealthy, balanced on the backs of middle class families, the elderly, and the poor.

The Republican's budget would reduce spending to support Medicare program management by $207 million in 2013. These cuts hinder the ability to keep pace with growing Medicare and Medicaid enrollment. These cuts would restrict patient access to care and delay payments to providers.

Under the GOP budget, 9.6 million students would see their Pell Grants cut in 2012. Their budget would also result in $430 million in cuts to the Head Start program, with 60,000 low-income children losing access to early childhood education.

The GOP budget would also cut $350 million from nutritional assistance for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). This would cut off funding for 700,000 women and children from receiving food necessary for healthy child development.

This ill-conceived budget would cut funds for Social Security by 5.4 percent in 2013 and 19 percent in future years, reducing vital services for our Nation's seniors. This budget ends the Medicare guarantee and increases costs for seniors—replacing Medicare's guarantee of health security with a voucher that shifts higher and higher costs onto seniors and the disabled over time. It cuts Medicaid by a third, while turning it into a block grant.

These are the priorities of the Republican majority in the House, Mr. Chair. The Republicans' FY2013 Budget favors tax cuts for the wealthy over the needs of children and seniors. The corporate tax cuts alone would cost $1 trillion in lost Federal revenue over the next decade. The Republican leadership's budget is a giveaway to the wealthiest Americans, who would receive an average tax cut of at least $150,000, while inevitably forcing drastic cuts on those most in need.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Fiscal Year 2013 Budget. Budgets are statements of priorities. Unfortunately, this budget does not reflect the priorities of my constituents and the American people: bolstering a strong middle class, investing in job creation, and ensuring a secure retirement.

The American middle class is the bedrock of our society. But the Republican Budget fails to recognize this. It gives the bulk of its $4.6 trillion in tax cuts to wealthy Americans. It cuts $166 billion from Pell Grants and federal student loans, effectively telling students to think twice about a college education. And it puts job creation on hold by cutting $31 billion from transportation and infrastructure investment in the next fiscal year.

The Republican Budget also cuts $11 billion from science and medical research by 2014. The two largest employers in my district are Stony Brook University and Brookhaven National Lab. When you factor in the additional $1 trillion in unspecified non-defense discretionary cuts over 10 years, reductions like these jeopardize the economic recovery and stifle the advances that can make the United States a competitive force in a global economy. And yet, the Republican Budget does not ask those who have benefited from investments of this type made in the past to shoulder any responsibility in resolving our fiscal issues.

After decades of hard work and sacrifice by our Nation's seniors, the Republican Budget replaces Medicare's health coverage guarantee with a voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage or a private insurance plan. If one scrutinizes this proposal, they will discover the voucher will very likely fail to keep pace with medical inflation, thereby threatening seniors' financial security by forcing them to bear the bulk of their medical costs and even leaving some retirees without health insurance as the Medicare eligibility age is raised.

The Republican Budget also makes drastic cuts to Medicaid, jeopardizing the ability of seniors to access nursing home care and threatening the health coverage Americans with meager incomes rely on.

Mr. Chair, it is important that this Congress refocus our efforts on bolstering the middle class, investing in job creation, and ensuring a secure retirement. That is how we will build an economy to last and make a better future in America for our children. The Republican Budget fails at this, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Majority's misguided budget.

Forty-seven years ago, when seniors were the most uninsured group in our nation, we made a promise that their health care would be guaranteed.

Because of that promise, tens of millions of older Americans have been assured of quality, affordable health care and a life of dignity.

Because of that promise, tens of millions of Americans have avoided bankruptcy and upended lives trying to find a way to ensure they or their aging parents receive the medical care they need and deserve.

But the Majority's budget seeks to break that promise by ending Medicare as we know it.

There are a host of problems with this proposal:

Instead of a guarantee of health care seniors would get a fixed amount voucher to help them partially pay for an insurance policy, assuming they can find one.

And given that the Majority also seeks to repeal the law that outlaws preexisting condition exclusions, as well as annual and lifetime coverage limits, there is no guarantee a senior would be able to find a plan, much less an affordable one.

This voucher would be for a fixed amount, meaning it would be worth less and less with each passing year.

In California, this would mean seniors' out of pocket costs would rise by at least $6,000 each year.

The bill would also raise Medicare's eligibility age, delaying the promise of a sound retirement for millions of working Americans.

This would mean over 5 million Californians would face the struggle of finding and paying for health care for 2 more years before they even qualify for the limited promise of care of the Majority's voucher program.

In addition to ending Medicare, the Ryan budget would whack away at the Medicaid program, which provides long term care for indigent seniors and the disabled.

Medicaid funding would drop and the responsibilities would be pushed onto the states, where seniors and persons with disabilities would have no assurances of coverage.

Anyone who has seen what has happened to state budgets across the country over the last few years should be under no illusions that hard pressed states won't cut Medicaid funding in tough times—they are doing it today!

Mr. Chair, my colleagues promoting this plan to end Medicare and slash Medicaid have argued that it's really the only choice we have.

They will argue that health care costs are bankrupting our nation and we simply have to make these changes in order to bring down our deficit to manageable levels.

And they will argue that these changes don't affect seniors today, only those off in some distant future.

None of those arguments hold water.

First, we do need to address our deficit and that means getting health care costs under control.

But their plan doesn't bring down health care costs—it just shifts those costs onto the backs of our nation's seniors.

Second, it is stunning that their plan again puts the onus for deficit reduction completely on seniors and working Americans, while providing huge tax breaks for the wealthy and big corporations.

Under this budget, no sacrifice is too large to ask of our nation's seniors and any sacrifice is too much to ask of our nation's most well off.

Third, this plan will affect today's seniors.

For example, it repeals important benefits—like access to free preventive screenings and annual wellness physicals—that seniors are already enjoying under Obamacare.

These benefits would be taken away from almost 60,000 seniors in my district.

The Ryan plan would also reopen the infamous "donut hole," immediately increasing annual prescription drug costs for millions of seniors.

This would affect over 6,000 seniors in my district immediately and cost them hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars each and every year.

And finally, the Ryan plan would weaken Medicare as the voucher program draws off healthier seniors and leaves behind the oldest and sickest, thereby undercutting the financial stability of the program.

I can already hear the calls that would come saying we just can't afford traditional Medicare.

Adopting this plan will cause untold harm to our nations' seniors and to the millions and millions of American families who today rely on Medicare for the promise of quality, affordable health care.

We made a promise—a promise that is working for millions of American seniors and their families.

We cannot break that promise.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 112, the budget resolution offered by my colleague Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, which cuts federal spending, faces our nation's debt crisis head on, and spurs economic recovery and job creation.

When President Obama was running for President four years ago, he promised to cut the deficit in half by the end of his term. Instead, his spending policies have left the American people with our nation's first, second, third and fourth year of trillion-plus dollar deficits—contributing more to the national debt than the 40 previous Presidents combined.

Unfortunately, the budget request that President Obama submitted to Congress last month is more of the same failed policies. It calls for spending increases to record levels, tax hikes on families and small businesses and still it adds more to our nation's debt for future generations to pay off.

President Obama's plan passes this compounding debt on to our children and grandchildren instead of making the difficult decisions necessary to protect our country's future. But at least he has a plan. The Senate has failed to even pass a budget in three years.

Chairman Ryan's proposal offers a real alternative to these failed policies. H. Res. 112 cuts federal spending by $5 trillion dollars. It takes on the true drivers of our debt—entitlement spending that takes up more than 60 percent of the federal budget—while strengthening Medicare and Medicaid so that these programs will continue to be available for future generations.

It reduces the size of the federal government to the historic average of 20 percent of the economy by 2015—allowing the private sector to grow and create jobs.

It reforms our broken tax code to spur job creation and economic opportunity by lowering tax rates, closing loopholes, and putting hard-working taxpayers ahead of special interests.

And it places our country on a path to pay off our national debt in as few as seven years. Americans need real jobs, real solutions, and real results—not more budget tricks or accounting gimmicks.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me creating an efficient, effective government that spends less and serves better, by supporting the Ryan budget resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, as I have said before, the federal budget is a moral document. It reflects, in dollars and cents, our national priorities. My priorities as a member of this body are supporting middle class families, helping to foster job creation, and promoting education, research and innovation that will help our economy grow over the long-term.

Unfortunately, for the second year in a row, the Republican budget resolution before us today fails to meet these goals and moves us in the wrong direction. At a time when economic inequality has risen to its highest level in decades, according to the Census Bureau, and after more than a decade of stagnant wages for middle-class Americans, we need a budget that strengthens our middle class, not weakens it.

And, once again, for the second year in a row, Republicans want to end the promise of Medicare to our seniors. Instead, seniors would receive a voucher to buy either private insurance or traditional Medicare—but what's so egregious about this proposal is that the voucher will fail to keep pace with projected health care costs over time. This budget puts insurance companies in charge of seniors' health. Our seniors would be forced to pay thousands more out of their own pockets on premiums for a plan that provides the same benefits seniors on Medicare are currently receiving. What if they don't have those extra thousands? In my home State of New Jersey, for example, the Republican budget will increase seniors out of pocket expenses by nearly $6,000. Moreover, this plan reopens the "donut hole" for seniors' prescription drug costs, by $2.2 billion this year and $44 billion by the end of the decade. More than 1 million New Jersey seniors will be forced to pay more for preventive services this year if this plan is enacted—services that are currently covered by Medicare, including mammograms, colonoscopies, and annual physicals.

This budget plan abandons investments in research and innovation—exactly the kind of investment we need to grow and sustain our economy over the long-term. This budget plan is a direct assault on Medicaid—it slashes $810 billion over 10 years. It turns Medicaid into a block grant and leaves it to already cash-strapped States to decide what to do next.

This budget plan cuts education funding on all levels—from pre-K through college—by $166 billion over the next decade. My home State of New Jersey, for example, will lose $8.4 million this year for Head Start—this will eliminate more than 1,000 enrollment slots for underserved children. Another 3,100 slots would be eliminated in Fiscal Year 2014. More than 20,000 New Jersey students would be negatively impacted by cuts to Title I. And for college-bound students, this plan freezes the maximum Pell Grant level and takes no action to prevent a doubling of interest rates on student loans starting this summer. We should be investing in education, not gutting it.

This budget cuts highway funding by 25 percent, weakening our ability to support our economic recovery and putting thousands of jobs at risk. This budget slashes food stamps by $133.5 billion over 10 years during a time when millions of Americans are still struggling to make ends meet.

While this budget all but dissolves the safety net, it maintains the costly tax breaks for corporations and the wealthy. How can we justify billions of dollars in tax breaks to the "Big 5" oil companies—which made more than $1 trillion in profits over the past decade—while tens of millions of Americans are still looking for work?

Despite all of these cuts, this budget resolution still fails to balance the budget over the next decade.

Getting our Nation's fiscal house in order is a task my colleagues and I take seriously. Of course, we always should be looking to remove wasteful spending and ineffective programs. I have supported, and will continue to support, thoughtful budget cuts that reduce the deficit by eliminating unnecessary spending and costly tax giveaways to industries reaping enormous profits. At the same time, though, we must also preserve investments in infrastructure, science, and education, along with safety net programs that assist the most vulnerable among us in obtaining housing, health care, and food. The budget before us today fails to strike this essential balance.

There are better ways, and I will be supporting alternative approaches that take a more balanced approach to our Nation's fiscal challenges. They protect the most vulnerable members of our society while making the investments in research, education, and innovation that are absolutely critical to sustaining our economic recovery. These alternatives invest $50 billion to fund jobs that address our urgent transportation needs. They include $5 billion to help keep cops on the beat and firefighters on the job. They protect Social Security from privatization and promote tax relief for working families. They invest in research and development and science education. And, at the end of the day, these alternatives achieve a balanced budget in 10 years.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget resolution and support one of these viable alternatives.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2013 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this 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 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,058,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,248,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,459,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,627,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,770,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,891,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,021,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,173,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,332,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,498,448,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$234,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$302,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$356,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$388,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$423,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$460,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$497,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$534,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$574,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$617,033,000,000.

(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: $2,793,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,681,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,756,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,888,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,998,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,117,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,290,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,455,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,570,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,780,807,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,891,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,769,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,784,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,892,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,977,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,080,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,248,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,398,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,531,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,748,801,000,000.

(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: -$832,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$520,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$324,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$264,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$207,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$188,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$227,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$224,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$199,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$250,353,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,072,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,769,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,277,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,752,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,216,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,676,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,168,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,657,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $21,121,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $21,627,396,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,261,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,860,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,260,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,597,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,874,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,125,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,417,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,717,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $15,005,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $15,363,610,000,000.

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 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $562,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $574,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $589,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $588,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,446,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $602,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $618,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $635,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,648,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $653,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $671,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $656,950,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $690,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $675,190,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $709,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $699,316,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $43,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,999,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $40,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,707,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,777,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,774,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $45,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,737,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,872,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $28,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,204,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $28,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $32,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $33,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,680,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,221,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $35,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,666,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $18,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,395,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $18,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,187,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$11,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $2,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$11,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$10,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$15,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $9,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$14,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $10,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,533,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $80,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $74,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $76,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $77,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $80,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $81,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $85,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $80,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $93,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,180,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $7,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $7,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $7,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $7,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,997,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $63,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $71,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $79,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $84,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $87,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $89,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $90,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $91,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,408,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $363,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $358,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $365,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $376,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $393,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $404,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $419,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $446,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $433,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $449,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $446,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $471,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $468,212,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $510,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $510,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $532,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $554,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $601,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $601,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $615,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $634,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $634,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $692,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $691,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $737,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $736,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $784,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $784,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $866,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $866,448,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $517,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $475,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $474,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $472,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $453,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $450,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $453,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $469,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $467,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $481,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $494,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $493,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $511,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,356,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $134,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $137,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $139,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $148,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $147,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $146,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $156,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $160,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $165,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $175,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,607,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $54,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $52,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $55,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $55,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $57,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $59,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $61,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $63,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,817,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, 23,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $25,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,449,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $344,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,415,000,000
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $356,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $391,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $447,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $565,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $618,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $664,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $696,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $696,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $730,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $730,179,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$22,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$50,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$94,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$93,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$96,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$111,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$113,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$117,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$120,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$123,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$121,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$125,413,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, -$84,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$94,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$94,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$104,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$104,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$110,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$110,655,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $96,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,727,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—Not later than April 27, 2012, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit 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 $8,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $19,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $33,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(2) 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 $3,750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $28,430,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $96,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(3) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $16,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $29,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $11,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $39,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(5) 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 $2,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $30,100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $78,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(6) 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 $1,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by $23,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by $53,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

SEC. 202. DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

(a) SUBMISSION.—In the House, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a bill carrying out the directions set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DIRECTIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following provisions:

(1) REPLACING THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.—The language shall amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established under that section consistent with this concurrent resolution.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include language making its application contingent upon the enactment of the reconciliation bill referred to in section 201.

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

SEC. 301. POLICY STATEMENT ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended budget 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 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 19 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 19 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 20.25 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 18.75 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 16 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate amounts of deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 1.25 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: -.25 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: -3 percent.

(4) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 53 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 38 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 10 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 resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. 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 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 in the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

SEC. 403. 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 resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

SEC. 404. 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 the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565) or 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 would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2013, the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2017, or the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

TITLE V—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 501. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014, the aggregate amount of advance appropriation shall not exceed—

(1) $54,462,000,000 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 other programs.

(d) 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.

SEC. 502. 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 appropriate levels and allocations in this resolution accordingly.

SEC. 503. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS FOR LEGISLATION.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—For purposes of enforcing this resolution, the revenue levels shall be those set forth in the March 2012 Congressional Budget Office baseline. The total amount of adjustments made under subsection (b) may not cause revenue levels to be below the levels set forth in paragraph (1)(A) of section 101 for fiscal year 2013 and for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution for—

(A) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001;

(B) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003;

(C) the budgetary effects of measures that adjust the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption amounts to prevent a larger number of taxpayers as compared with tax year 2008 from being subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax or of allowing the use of nonrefundable personal credits against the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(D) the budgetary effects of extending the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010;

(E) the budgetary effects of measures providing a 20 percent deduction in income to small businesses;

(F) the budgetary effects of measures implementing trade agreements;

(G) the budgetary effects of provisions repealing the tax increases set forth in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010;

(H) the budgetary effects of provisions reforming the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(I) the budgetary effects of measures reforming the tax code and lowering tax rates.

(2) A measure does not qualify for adjustments under paragraph (1)(H) if it—

(A) increases the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022; or

(B) increases revenues over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022, other than by—

(i) repealing or modifying the individual mandate (codified as section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

(ii) modifying the subsidies to purchase health insurance (codified as section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(c) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or a 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 2013 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.

(d) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 through fiscal year 2022 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels of this resolution.

SEC. 504. 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 first four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 505. 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 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 allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 to 2022.

SEC. 506. 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 included in this resolution.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Any legislation for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations or aggregates of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 504.

SEC. 507. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate of the Congressional Budget Office 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.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a), 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.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Congressional Budget Office shall estimate the change in net income to the National Flood Insurance Program by this Act if such income is included in a reconciliation bill provided for in section 201, as if such income were deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 508. BUDGET RULE RELATING TO 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 of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, or any Act 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. 509. 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 and the 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 2013. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act does 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 2013, 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. 510. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The following provisions of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) shall no longer have force or effect:

(1) Section 3(e) relating to advance appropriations.

(2) Section 3(f) relating to the treatment of off-budget administrative expenses.

TITLE VI—POLICY

SEC. 601. 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 and near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2022 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 6.3 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 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 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.

(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.

(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. 602. 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, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2036, according to the Social Security Trustees Report the combined Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the trust funds in 2036, benefits will be cut 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The current recession has exacerbated the crisis to Social Security. The Congressional Budget Office continues to project permanent cash deficits.

(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) Americans deserve action by their elected officials on Social Security reform. It is critical that the Congress and the administration work together in a bipartisan fashion to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

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

(1)(A) 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 in its 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 should, not 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; and

(B) such recommendations provided to the President should be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2)(A) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submits its recommendations, the President shall promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress, including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year; and

(B) the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce such legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred should report such legislation, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in and near retirement;

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

(C) improve fairness for participants; and

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

SEC. 603. 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. 604. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

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

(1) The Government Accountability Office 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 Rules of the House of Representatives require each standing committee to hold at least one hearing every four months on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

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

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated. Such recommendations shall be made publicly available.

TITLE VII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING 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 Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–423.

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 20 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 Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. MULVANEY. I rise to claim time in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,065,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,373,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,640,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,835,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,996,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,123,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,262,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,434,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,606,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,782,963,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$227,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$177,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$175,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$180,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$198,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$228,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$255,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$273,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$300,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$332,518,000,000.

(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: $2,981,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,036,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,183,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,388,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,545,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,713,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,903,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,116,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,299,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,504,615,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,078,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,098,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,197,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,385,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,506,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,653,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,875,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,070,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,264,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,472,110,000,000.

(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: -$1,012,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$724,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$556,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$549,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$510,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$529,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$613,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$635,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$658,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$689,147,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,314,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,251,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,050,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,855,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,624,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,419,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $22,288,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $23,197,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $24,143,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $25,123,397,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,517,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,330,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,981,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,618,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,215,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,824,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,518,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $17,245,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $18,007,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,818,701,000,000.

SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $559,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $566,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $579,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $590,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $602,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $589,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $615,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $628,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $642,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $656,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $673,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $662,113,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $47,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $50,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $52,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $54,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $56,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $57,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,168,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $34,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,996,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $4,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,174,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $37,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $42,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,362,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,538,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $8,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $9,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $22,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $15,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,275,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $88,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $101,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $107,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $114,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $120,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $127,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $92,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $94,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $95,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $97,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,566,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $12,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,958,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $82,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $85,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $85,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $95,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $99,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $103,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $104,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $105,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $106,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,209,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $372,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $473,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $542,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $538,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $590,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $626,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $664,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $662,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $707,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $706,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $761,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $749,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $800,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $799,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $851,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $849,973,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $525,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $553,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $570,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $617,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $633,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $653,683,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $653,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $715,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $715,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $763,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $762,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $810,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $885,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $885,426,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $545,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $537,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $538,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $546,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $544,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $546,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $538,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $561,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $573,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $586,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $604,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,786,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $135,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $136,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $139,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $148,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $146,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $144,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $153,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $157,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $161,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $170,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,088,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $55,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $61,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $67,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,496,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $37,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $40,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $45,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,669,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $347,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $360,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $400,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $466,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $466,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $539,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $614,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $686,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $751,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $751,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $804,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $804,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $858,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $848,474,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$10,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$20,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$20,286,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$18,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$20,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$26,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$60,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$61,008,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$79,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$87,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$94,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$94,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$100,689,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$100,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$99,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$99,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,959,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $96,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,727,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, 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, it occurred to me during the budget debate that something was missing from the debate. As my colleagues across the aisle offered their various amendments through the course of the day and into the evening, it occurred to me that the President's budget had not been offered as an amendment by the Democrat Members of the House Budget Committee, and that as we were getting information about which amendments were being offered here today on the floor as amendments to the overall GOP budget, it occurred to me that, again, that same oversight had taken place.

Clearly, it must be an oversight. Clearly, my colleagues meant to offer the President's budget as an amendment and simply failed to do so. And so in a pique of bipartisanship, I thought I would help my colleagues across the aisle out a little bit and offer the President's budget, which is exactly what this amendment is.

This amendment is the President's budget as analyzed, not scored, but analyzed by the CBO, nothing more and nothing less. It has a lot in here that I imagine my colleagues would like. It has, for example, $1.9 trillion in new taxes. It has new taxes on income, new taxes on the giving of gifts, new taxes on gasoline, and even new taxes on dying.

It has $1.5 trillion in new spending, spending on welfare, spending on unemployment, and spending on green energy. The term ''Solyndra'' comes to mind, I would imagine. In fact, it has so many new taxes and new spending, it seems to be bringing the phrase ''tax-and-spend liberal'' back into fashion here in Washington, D.C. So, clearly, it must simply be an oversight that has not been offered by my colleagues.

But that's not all. The budget that the President offered and that is contained in this amendment never balances—never balances. It is a balanced approach to reach a never-balancing budget. It also fails to deal completely with our entitlement problems.

So, again, I say, Mr. Chairman, I think there's a lot here for my colleagues to like. I look forward to their defense of the President's budget. And in many ways, I would suppose this is a landmark document for the Democrats as we go into this election year.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to speak on this important issue.

The Acting CHAIR. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And I'm opposed for a simple reason. This document filed by Mr. MULVANEY is not the President's budget. And it's being portrayed as a very misleading—it was a very misleading presentation of the President's budget.

This is the President's budget.

If you look at all the other budgets presented today, you'll find numbers and you'll find policy statements that describe the policies behind the budget. The thing Mr. MULVANEY filed—no policy. In fact, he just said the President's policy raises gas taxes, I believe? That's just a false statement.

The other issue is why you have a number for revenue in the President's budget. You mentioned that there was a revenue number. The President never pretended otherwise. The President's budget takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction. It makes cuts, and it raises revenue.

Let's talk about how he raises revenue. He raises revenue, in part, by getting rid of subsidies on the big oil companies. We think at a time of record profits, we don't need to have taxpayer subsidies for big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues, almost every one of them, have signed this pledge to Grover Norquist saying they won't get rid of one oil subsidy or one tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction. Well, the President thinks we need a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Now, you wouldn't know from reading Mr. MULVANEY's document, what he puts in place as the President's budget, that that's how the President raises revenue. You wouldn't know from Mr. MULVANEY's document that the President also asks the very top 2 percent of taxpayers to go back to paying the same top rate they were during the Clinton administration, a time when the economy was booming, because the President thinks we need to take a balanced approach, again, a combination of revenues and spending cuts, because the President believes, and I agree, that if you do it the way the Republicans do it, without asking the folks at the very top to share some responsibility, it means you deal with the budget at the expense of everybody else, at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income Americans, and at the expense of important investments in our economy like investments in transportation.

Their budget cuts transportation next year by 46 percent at a time when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry. Their budget puts the brakes on the budding economic growth.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's end this charade. The gentleman said he wanted to get beyond politics. This is politics at its absolute worst, presenting something as the President's budget without the policy detail, without the explanation to the American people about what's in the President's budget. As a result, he presents a very misleading version of what the President has asked us to do.

In fact, the Democratic alternative that we will propose later adopts the general framework of the President's budget. We don't adopt every single proposal he makes in here, but we take the general framework. The difference is we have those policy statements, and we make it clear that we want to get rid of the subsidies for the big oil companies at a time they're making record profits. We make it clear that we want millionaires, people making a million dollars a year, to go back to paying what they were during the Clinton administration. We make that clear in our alternative.

So let's not play this political charade. We're going to have the Democratic alternative that, as I said, takes the framework of the President's proposal. Our Republican colleagues will have an opportunity to vote against that. But this is not the President's budget, and let's not pretend it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, we really find ourselves in an interesting spot here. The ranking member of Budget finds himself in a very difficult position, standing in opposition of the President's budget. And he says, well, this isn't the President's budget. And for a moment, let's assume it's not.

Where is it? Where is it? If it was such a good document, why didn't they present it? We don't understand it.

I was in a committee meeting today, and the Secretary of the Treasury was just going on about how good the President's budget was, how it had this balanced approach, and it had this glide path to reducing the deficit. I asked him, well, who from your party is going to present that? He said, I don't know. You would think with such an awesome document that puts us on this great path of a future for our Nation that surely the Democrats would present their own budget. But they have yet to do that.

□ 1950

In fact, their side is empty right now. You'd think it would be full with them lining up to speak in favor of the President's budget, but they have yet to do that. In fact, there's much of an exodus here.

But let's talk about what the budget really is, because it's more than the framework or the document; it is a vision. It's a vision for where we think we're going to take our Nation. What the President's budget is is a vision of debt and dependency. Maybe that's why they didn't present it. But yet we're presenting a much different approach, one of opportunity and prosperity.

As we conclude these debates—and they may call it a gimmick. And if they want to call the President's budget a gimmick, let them call that a gimmick. But as we conclude this debate, we're all going to be making a decision. We've been empowered with the opportunity to vote for our constituents. They've given us that voting card, and we're going to have a decision to make. We're going to be choosing between a balanced approach that raises taxes, increases the size of government, increases our debt—it's debt and dependency—or we can choose the balanced budget approach. The Republican budget lowers taxes, has an energy plan, puts us on that path to a balanced budget. That is the choice that will be before us.

So I hope that my colleagues, as they debate the President's budget, will reject that debt and dependency and choose that path of the balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I guess we're going to spend the next I don't know how many minutes talking about something that's not the President's budget. It's an attempt to be misleading about what the President's budget does because it leaves out all the content, leaves out the substance.

You look at the Republican budget, they've got a lot of sections on policy. You look at the other alternatives that are being presented, they have alternatives and policy statements. This is a bunch of numbers without the explanation.

Now, do the Democrats, for example, think that the President invested enough in his budget in LIHEAP, the low-income energy program for low-income individuals. We actually have a majority in our caucus that thinks the President should have put a little more into that. But that's only the kind of detail you would know if you went through the President's budget, not this thing that Mr. MULVANEY claims is the President's budget, which it's just not. So just to be clear: This is not the President's budget, and therefore it obviously is a political gimmick.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing up this debate.

And this is the President's budget we're discussing. When you look at this resolution, this contains the same kind of language as any resolution that's brought to the floor contains. But let's talk about what it seems like some Members of the Democratic Party on the other side are so afraid to talk about, and that is what the President's budget really does.

The President's budget never even comes close to balancing, first of all. So this President, who campaigned 4 years ago on reducing the deficit, on trying to bring fiscal responsibility to Washington, goes the opposite way, adding trillions more dollars of debt, mountains of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

What's worse, if you look at the policies, $1.9 trillion of job-killing tax increases. What does that mean to families? Hardworking families out there are looking at this, and they're knowing just what this is going to do to jobs in this country when you add another $1.9 trillion.

Just look at one part. They love bragging about all the taxes they're raising on American oil. In fact, their budget, President Obama's budget that we're talking about right now, President Obama's budget adds $40 billion a year in new taxes on American energy. The irony is the President's tax increase on American energy doesn't apply to OPEC nations, so OPEC countries are now incentivized to send more oil here. But if you make it in America—it's in the President's budget, go look at it—$40 billion of new tax increases if you make it in America. What is that going to do to gas prices that are already skyrocketing under President Obama's policies?

American families out there know what that means. If you add $40 billion a year in new taxes on American-made energy, that will only increase the price that is already too high. What's worse is that it kills American jobs because it says—and President Obama said this; in his budget President Obama says, if you're OPEC and you're sending us oil, we're not going to raise your taxes in the President's budget. But if you make energy in America, he'll raise taxes $40 billion a year.

This is the most warped policy I've ever seen. I hope we reject it, and then take up the budget that we're going to present that actually puts us in balance and has good, sound policy to create jobs.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let's talk a little bit about energy policy. One of the things you wouldn't know from the document that Mr. MULVANEY put forward claiming it's the President's budget is that the President actually provides the resources to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to help police speculators in the oil market. Because what we're seeing today is that, because of conditions around the world, a lot of those are being taken advantage of by people who are engaged in excessive speculation on the oil market, driving it up. But the Republican budget doesn't want the cop on the beat. The Republican budget doesn't want to police the speculators because, you know what, they're just doing fine. But again, Mr. MULVANEY's budget—what he pretends is the President's budget—you wouldn't know that. But if you looked in the President's real budget, you would know that kind of thing. That's why this exercise is such a farce.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you to my good friend.

We actually did this on the floor last night. Part of it was an attempt to sort of help folks through some of the absurdity of the rhetoric compared to the reality of math.

One of the fun slides we brought on is using the current budget numbers and the fact that we're borrowing about $3.5 billion a day. We actually have this one board—and we're putting it up on our Web site—that actually shows a clock. On that clock it has some of the President's budget policies. And one in there is one we've already sort of heard talked about or alluded to, and people like to call it the ''Buffet Rule.'' Well, do you realize that all of the rhetoric around something like the Buffet Rule and those new taxes and those needs for those folks to pay more would pay for—I think we came up with 3 minutes and 30 seconds. It would cover 3 minutes and 30 seconds of borrowing a day.

We did some slides earlier that talked about not just taxing Big Oil, but if you taxed all fossil fuels. And what we're talking about is getting rid of their depletion allowance and actually going after their depreciation tables. That came out to about 2 minutes and 30 seconds of covering borrowing a day.

The reason I stand behind this microphone right now is the political theater of—it's great rhetoric. I'm sure it's nice and poll tested. But it doesn't solve any of the problems. That's why this is a joyous moment to see the other side stand up and embrace the President's budget with such enthusiasm.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina is prepared to close, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I hear my good friend from Maryland. I understand he thinks it's a charade. I got the same press release that he got from the White House. They called it a gimmick, he calls it a charade. And they go on to talk about how they lack any details.

I've got the same stack that my colleague from Maryland has. I have the President's budget here. But we also have what we used to formulate the amendment, which is the analysis of the President's 2013 budget from the Congressional Budget Office. In there, if you take the time to review it, you'll find a summary of the way the President treats the 2001–2003 tax reductions, the alternative minimum tax, limiting deductions and exclusions, modifying estate and gift taxes, other revenue proposals, more tax provisions, OCO, the automatic procedures in the Budget Control Act, the President's cap on deductions and exclusions, deals with initiatives that will widen the deficit, transportation, Medicare, Medicaid, the Build America Bonds Program. The President's budget does not include reductions, and increases mandatory outlays.

It goes on to talk about overseas contingency, disaster relief, $2 billion for a program, integrity initiatives. The details are here. The details are here. Let's make no mistake about what we're voting on. This is the President's budget.

Again, I got the White House memo and it says, you know, we encourage Democrats to vote against our own budget—that's what the President said today—because what could be in this amendment is raising taxes on the middle class.

□ 2000

It could be in here, Mr. Chairman, but only if it's in here. They go on to say that this amendment could include severe cuts to important programs, and I guess, in theory, it could, but only if it's in here.

Let's make one thing and one thing extraordinarily clear. This is the President's budget. This is the CBO, the nonpartisan analysis of what the President gave us of what I guess, several millions of dollars, of tax dollars, were spent in preparing. We spent an entire day debating this and examining this in the Budget Committee.

It's not a charade. It's not a gimmick unless what the President sent us is the same.

We are voting on the President's budget. I would encourage my Democrats to embrace this landmark Democrat document and support it. Personally, I'll be voting against it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend from South Carolina wants to play make-believe today, but the reality is that this is not the President's budget, and we've already shown you the President's budget.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me just say one thing. You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time; and I can tell you, the Republican budget is not fooling anybody.

I just want to talk about one aspect of the President's budget on transportation. We know for every billion dollars that we spend, it generates 44,000 jobs. However, the Republicans refuse to pass a budget.

The Transportation Committee, throughout the history, has been bipartisan. We have worked together. The Republicans and the Democrats over in the Senate have passed a bill. The Republicans refuse to take up the bill on transportation because, for once, you don't want to put the American people back to work.

I say again, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Again, we can stand here all we want and play let's pretend. The reality is that the budget that's before us is not the President's budget.

As I indicated earlier, the Democratic alternative later takes the framework of the President's budget and adopts some of the policies of the President's budget. We don't accept every single spending proposal or spending cut which is laid out in great detail here. But that presents a framework.

And I should say to my colleagues that one of the things you would not know from reading this Republican version of the President's proposal is that, unlike the Republican budget, the President's plan does not end the Medicare guarantee. It does not extend tax breaks for the highest income Americans. It doesn't provide another windfall tax cut for those Americans financed by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans. It doesn't cut the transportation budget by 46 percent next year, at a time when we have high unemployment in the construction industry. The President's budget doesn't do that. The Republican budget does do that.

We will later present that balanced approach that says, in order to tackle our deficits, we have to make some cuts, some tough cuts. Congress has already made $1 trillion in cuts. We have more cuts. But we should also close some of those special interest tax loopholes for the purpose of reducing the deficit, because if we don't do that, it means that we're providing—essentially asking nothing of the very wealthy, and that means we have to reduce the deficit at the expense of everybody else in America.

So let's end the charade. Let's end this game of make-believe. This is not the President's budget, and unless there's some of our colleagues who want to play fantasyland, I suggest we get down to reality, and that's why we're opposing this document, the Mulvaney amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. MULVANEY. I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting 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. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,335,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,680,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,004,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,219,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,399,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,545,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,701,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,890,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,078,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,272,162,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $41,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $129,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $187,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $203,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $204,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $192,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: $181,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $180,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $169,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $154,993,000,000.

(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: $3,128,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,111,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,189,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,395,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,546,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,698,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,867,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,063,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,230,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,423,309,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,169,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,176,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,237,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,397,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,511,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,639,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,840,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,018,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,195,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,390,772,000,000.

(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: -$833,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$496,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$233,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$177,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$111,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$93,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$138,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$128,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$117,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$118,609,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,147,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,822,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,241,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,632,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,003,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,371,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,777,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,172,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $20,556,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,932,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,336,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,913,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,476,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,661,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,820,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,026,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,231,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $14,439,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,668,000,000,000.

SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $553,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $564,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $625,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,506,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $56,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $48,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $51,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $53,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $54,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $55,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $57,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $58,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,145,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $39,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $34,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $36,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $36,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $37,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,978,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $7,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $6,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $5,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,165,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $42,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,857,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $20,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,003,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $8,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $9,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $22,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $15,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,275,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $138,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $126,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $117,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $124,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $130,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $137,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $102,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $104,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $105,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $107,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,475,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $13,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,949,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $107,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $102,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $96,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $104,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $114,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $118,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $122,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $123,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $124,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $126,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,796,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $382,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $482,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $546,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $596,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $601,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $638,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $676,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $675,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $719,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $718,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $773,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $761,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $813,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $812,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $869,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,378,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $526,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $562,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $588,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $639,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $659,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $658,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $682,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $682,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $747,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $747,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $801,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $800,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $855,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $855,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $938,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $938,644,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $580,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $547,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $548,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $556,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $554,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $549,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $556,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $571,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $583,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $580,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $596,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $614,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,695,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $141,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $144,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $153,005,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $152,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $151,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $149,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $158,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $162,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $166,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $175,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,042,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $55,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $58,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $59,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $63,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,487,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $37,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $40,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $45,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,669,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $346,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $346,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $356,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $390,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $444,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $444,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $500,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $555,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $604,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $645,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $674,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $703,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,024,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $1,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,436,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$15,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$18,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$18,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$18,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$25,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$16,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$58,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$59,683,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$79,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$92,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$96,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$96,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$102,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$102,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,766,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $96,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $28,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $9,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $2,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $52,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I first want to acknowledge all 42 members of the Congressional Black Caucus who endorsed this presentation, but especially our Budget, Appropriations, and Taxation Taskforce and the FY13 Budget chairs, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, and Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who is the emcee at a dinner and cannot be here with us.

This budget, Mr. Chair, itself, is a statement of our beliefs as a Nation. It is the way we choose to run government and help the people we serve. Our FY 2013 alternative Federal budget will address the deficit while protecting important safety net programs needed by our communities.

The CBC's top priorities for the 112th Congress are promoting job creation and economic development, providing lifetime educational opportunities, protecting access to health care, and protecting the right to vote and justice for all Americans. We can only make these priorities a reality by sustaining and strengthening the programs that invest in and protect all Americans, whether it is workforce investment, unemployment insurance, investment in unemployment, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, or with the onslaught of these voter laws across the country, proper funding of the Election Assistance Commission. These programs are vital to national interest because they train our workforce, stabilize our economy, and provide funding for our cities and States throughout the Nation.

I understand that now is the time for us, as Americans, to sacrifice in order to protect our children and our children's children. However, we struggle, as a caucus, to understand how the proposed majority budget helps achieve this goal.

More recently, due to many strategic investments led by the President, the Nation's overall unemployment rate has been lowered; however, the African American unemployment rate remains nearly double the national average. In order to improve this dire situation and to ensure every American's full recovery, we must make smart and targeted investments for all America's vulnerable communities.

Government investment in people, education, infrastructure, and innovation can create jobs. Over time, the jobs created by these strategic investments pay for themselves and then some. Investments allow people to earn, learn, spend, and save. Cutting programs that assist hardworking Americans, help families with their most basic needs, maintain our crumbling infrastructure, and expand access to educational opportunities will only make unemployment statistics worse.

Our success as a Nation is interwoven in the success of all communities. Until we grasp that concept as a Nation, we will never see the full potential of the United States of America; and for that, I am truly concerned.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of our committee, BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia.

□ 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget. The CBC budget is a plan that significantly reduces our deficit over the next decade while increasing economic opportunities and promoting job creation in every corner of our society. Deficit reduction is about making tough choices, but the path to fiscal responsibility must not be on the backs of our Nation's most vulnerable communities.

Our budget makes those tough choices, but it doesn't jeopardize Social Security, turn Medicaid into a block grant, or dismantle the Medicare guarantee. The fundamental choice we have to make is a choice between millionaires and Medicare.

The CBC budget extends the Bush-era tax cuts only for hardworking middle class American families but pays for this extension through tax reform by closing corporate loopholes and giveaways, deterring aggressive speculation in the stock market—the speculation that helped create the 2008 fiscal crisis and the recent gas price increase—and we ensure that millionaires who benefited most from income growth, tax cuts, and bailouts in the last decade contribute their fair share.

With additional revenue, the CBC budget restores funding for important programs cut in the Budget Control Act of 2011, we cancel the sequester for security and nonsecurity programs, and we match the Democratic alternative on defense spending. Our budget also makes targeted investments that will create jobs in the short term by funding transportation and infrastructure projects, and our budget will ensure our long-term prosperity by investing in education and job training initiatives, including an increase in the maximum Pell Grant by nearly $1,000, to $6,500.

The CBC budget will positively impact every sector of our economy, cement the foundation of a strong economic recovery, and reduce the deficit by $770 billion more over the next decade than the Republican budget, as this chart shows.

The CBC budget outlines specific recommendations to achieve this goal. The Republican budget, on the other hand, simply instructs the Ways and Means Committee to find $4 trillion in new revenues and then instructs the Appropriations Committee to find spending cuts in the range of almost a trillion dollars. In light of the fact that the supercommittee failed to find $1.2 trillion, it is unlikely that anybody will figure out how to fill this $5 trillion hole in the Republican budget. But even if they do, the CBC budget still has $770 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, there is a clear difference between the Republican budget and the CBC budget, and that difference is the CBC budget chooses Medicare over millionaires. I urge my colleagues to support the Cleaver amendment to ensure a fairer and more prosperous future for America.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this budget. I am proud of the fact that we are actually debating a budget; for you see, you look over to the other body, you look to the United States Senate, and you'll see it's been more than 1,050 days, an exceptional amount of time—years, in fact—since the United States Senate has actually discussed a budget.

And here we are debating a budget. There's a contrast in vision. There's a contrast in priorities, but we're debating this. On some issues, there is some common ground; but on other things, there is a divergence in our approach.

This budget that's being presented here as an amendment raises taxes by more than $6 trillion. Mr. Chairman, let me put in context what $1 trillion is. If you spent $1 million a day every day, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to $1 trillion.

So what we have to have is a realization of the fiscal woes that we face ourselves. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up.

The reality is we cannot face tens of trillions of dollars in debt because there's a consequence of that. The consequence of this massive debt: rising interest rates, devaluation of the dollar. There's so many things. Inflation as you throw more money into the marketplace.

Imagine what this world would be like if we didn't have what will be, at the end of this year, nearly $16 trillion in debt. Right now we're paying more than $600 million a day in interest on that debt.

So, while I think there is common ground and appreciation of what needs to happen for our kids and our future and investments that we do need to make, what they would like to do in terms of infrastructure and roads and all of these types of things and our military, we're saddled with a $16 trillion debt. So we don't have that $600 million. We really don't get anything for that. We have to pay that as interest on the debt.

That's where you see a contrast. What is being proposed here versus what the Republicans are offering in their budget, which has passed through the Budget Committee, is they would have to spend $5.3 trillion more over 10 years than what we have proposed.

So I stand in opposition to this. I appreciate the passion and commitment they have to their agenda, but I do want to recognize, and I hope we can applaud on both sides of the aisle at least here in the House of Representatives, we're actually debating a budget.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, Mr. CLEAVER.

Mr. Chairman, prior to 1994, Congress acted to ensure that Americans had guaranteed support under the Social Security Act. It was a three-legged stool. The American social contract provided retirement security for retirees through Social Security, health coverage for elders with Medicare, dignified care for the infirm and disabled under Medicaid and sustenance for low-income families with children.

Now, in 1994, on a bipartisan basis, this body breached the Social Security Act's contract with the people and ''ended welfare as we know it.''

Now, this Republican budget says that that is a model for what this budget should do. It recalls that victory, and I quote from the narrative under the Path to Prosperity, a blueprint for American Renewal:

> This budget completes the successful work of transforming welfare by reforming other areas of America's safety net to ensure that welfare does not entrap able-bodied citizens into lives of complacency and dependency.

We've heard on this floor that we're going to make sure that the safety net does not become a hammock. So, in other words, Medicare and Medicare recipients are now welfare recipients.

So what this budget does is it ends the guarantee of health care for retirees, turning it into a voucher program, and cuts $30 billion over the next decade.

The program, Medicaid, it is now a welfare program, and Grandma, who is in the nursing home, is now a welfare recipient who is lying in a hammock instead of living out her life in dignity, and you cut $810 billion out of that fund over the next decade.

Another entitlement program, food stamps, which served 45 million people during this recession, half of all Americans are now poor. You're going to amend that entitlement program by cutting $134 billion out over the next decade.

The CBC budget rejects the breach of the Social Security Act and renews that contract with Americans. It rejects the 62 percent of the Republican budget that cuts $5.3 trillion—62 percent of it taken from those Americans who are most vulnerable—yet it provides deficit reduction of $3.4 trillion over a 10-year period of time.

Yes, we do have different priorities. We prioritize retirees, elders, the disabled, and infirm over millionaires.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about the remainder of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the previous offering by Mr. MULVANEY. I'd like to rise and speak in opposition to the administration's proposed 2013 budget plan. I'd like to speak about one particular issue of concern.

Despite the administration's emphasizing of the importance of cybersecurity and the need to retain our technological edge, this budget presents a stark contradiction to these priorities. Key program areas that are essential to maintaining our Nation's 21st century defense initiatives have been unreasonably slashed in this proposal.

For example, the Air Force's science and technology cyber funding has been cut 17 percent. Over $1 billion has been cut from the Air Force's total funding level for research, development, testing, and evaluation programs.

□ 2020

I can personally attest to the innovative accomplishments that are produced by the Air Force Research Labs, such as Rome Lab in Rome, New York. For instance, the Air Force Research Labs were the first to institute computer network attack and exploitation as a formal science and technology discipline.

Secretary Panetta has warned that a cyberattack could very well be the next Pearl Harbor that our Nation confronts. Both our defense enterprises and our commercial economy have become dependent on information technology, which makes it critical that we protect our networks. We can't say one thing and do another when it comes to prioritizing our 21st century cyberdefenses.

I urge my colleagues to support our national security by voting against this budget plan.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the U.S. Virgin Islands, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong and proud support of the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, which builds on the President's and the Democratic budget, is fiscally responsible, and restores America's promise and invests in our future. As a physician and chair of the Health Braintrust, I am particularly pleased with the investment we make in health.

The CBC budget provides an additional $10 billion in 2013, which protects Medicare and Medicaid, and which fully funds the Affordable Care Act, the Minority AIDS Initiative, and the AIDS Drug Assistance Program. It supports the Office of Minority Health. Finally, it provides adequate funding for the new institute at NIH.

We provide robust funding for important prevention and public health programs like the block grant, maternal and child health, oral health programs, and community-centric efforts to address the socioeconomic determinants of health. We also increase funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, for the training of underrepresented minorities for the health workforce and, for the first time, for health facilities improvements and construction.

Health care is a right. The CBC, through this budget, ensures that all Americans will enjoy that right. We make a strong investment in health and much more, and we still reduce the deficit by $3.4 trillion over the next 10 years. I urge an ''aye'' vote.

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

One of the moral obligations, I think, is not only to the current generation but to the older Americans who have poured their hearts and souls into this contract. They've lived with the assumption that certain things are going to be there. We have to live up to those obligations, but we also have to live up to the obligations that we have for our kids and our grandkids.

One of my goals and objectives is to leave this country better than how I found it. One of the things that the House Republican budget does over the course of time is balance the budget and pay off the debt, which is something we have to do. So the fundamental question becomes, How do you do that?

Now, I think where we have some common ground is that we want to broaden the base. The Republicans are suggesting that we lower the rates. Let people keep their own money and spend their own money. That is fundamentally what the United States of America is all about. The contrast here in what's being proposed is that they want to broaden the base—again, common ground—but they want to raise the rates, and that's where I think we have a fundamental challenge. We talk about what people have to pay, their fair share and whatnot. Yet let's look historically at what has happened in the United States of America.

Historically, we have spent less than 20 percent of our gross domestic product. When the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency, they raised that up over 24 percent. That is more than 24 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government in this country. I think that's immoral. I think that's wrong. We have an obligation—we have a duty—to live within our means and to provide opportunity and liberty for people to thrive. No matter where they are in life, the United States of America is about freedom, it's about liberty, it's about the opportunity to succeed—and that's the foundation of this country. That's what I'm committed to. That's what a responsible Federal Government does.

The proper role of government is limited in its scope, and the proper role of government is a role of government. To me, that means the Department of Defense and other things to protect our Nation. That's where we should put our priorities, and that's why I think that this budget that the House Republicans have proposed is so responsible. I don't think we're just one good tax increase away from prosperity in this country, and that's, in part, why I stand in opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I want to first thank the Congressional Black Caucus for their leadership. The fact is that they are the conscience of this Congress. Thank you so very much.

Let me say that transportation and infrastructure, if adequately funded, will generate thousands of jobs. In fact, for every $1 billion we invest in transportation it generates 44,000 permanent jobs and $6.2 billion in economic activity. With the CBC's initial investment of $50 billion in infrastructure funding, this budget would create over 2 million good-paying jobs. It would also allow us to fix our failing bridges, aging transit systems, and crumbling roads.

In addition, let me mention one thing about the VA. The Republicans often mention, What did the Democrats do when they were in charge? We passed the largest VA budget in the history of the United States of America.

Republicans often talk the talk. Democrats walk the walk.

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

You have to recognize how much money the Federal Government is spending here. We're going to spend in the range of about $3.5 trillion to $3.6 trillion in a 12-month period. Part of my rhetorical question here is: If that's not stimulative to the economy, why isn't it? What are we spending our money on if it's not intended to, in part, stimulate the economy? There are things that we have to do in terms of security and in providing for the FAA and for the Department of Defense, but we have to utilize those resources in a very wise way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank chairman EMANUEL CLEAVER for his tremendous leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and of many caucuses in this House. I also thank Representative BOBBY SCOTT and Representative GWEN MOORE and all of our CBC colleagues for their tireless efforts on this budget.

At a time when America is facing the greatest income inequality since the Great Depression, we must stand up and put the needs of the most vulnerable over the wants of the most wealthy, the special interests, and Big Oil. The Congressional Black Caucus' budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and our values.

This budget makes important investments in job creation, transportation, health care, and education. The CBC budget also protects the safety net without cutting Social Security or destroying Medicaid or by ending the Medicare guarantee, as the Republican budget does. We must ensure that those who have borne the brunt of this recession, who have experienced the highest unemployment rates, and the highest rates of poverty—communities of color—have an opportunity to return to the workplace in order to support their families, have access to education and to the American Dream.

These should be the values and priorities of a budget—a budget for everyone in mind, not just for the 1 percent. These are the priorities that will ensure our country and all of its people, not just the 1 percent, recover fully from this devastating recession.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that the gentleman from Utah has suggested the need to reduce the deficit. The Congressional Black Caucus budget beats the Republican budget by $770 billion. Then he talks about tax increases, but doesn't mention the fine print in the Republican budget that instructs the Ways and Means Committee to find $4 trillion in tax increases.

So, if fiscal responsibility is the idea, the budget of the Congressional Black Caucus beats the Republican budget by $770 billion over 10 years.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to yield the gentleman some additional time. I know he has a number of speakers who are still left. I am happy to do that. So that is my intention as you allocate the rest of your time.

For now, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for his generosity and courtesy.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 2030

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding to me and, again, join my colleagues in thanking him for his leadership, as well as the chairman of our CBC Budget Committee, Mr. SCOTT, the work that Congresswoman MOORE does on this committee, and all the others that have gathered here.

And I thank my good friend for a vigorous debate. I would only say to you that in the course of our debate this evening and today, we've heard of the mountain of debt and the need to cut, cut, cut. It is all right to have a difference of opinion, but what I would argue is that there are documented economists that say that if you invest in human capital, if you invest in people, then you build up the economy, you make things, you make things in America.

I don't want to leave Americans, if you will, on the trash heap of despair. I don't want to leave bodies straddled all along the highways, those who are knocking on doors of colleges, those who are trying to get into primary and secondary education, seniors who are cast out on the streets out of nursing homes. That's where we're going.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

So I am standing here to try to end the elimination of Medicare and the destruction of jobs and the taking of money from the poor.

The CBC budget is responsible in that it's ending the mortgage interest deductions for vacation homes and yachts. It provides additional tax relief for the middle class. It provides a $25 billion increase for education and job training; $50 billion in transportation infrastructure, creating jobs; rolling back the harmful cuts to American Federal employees, recognizing that they provide services that are needed; $12 billion above the President's budget regarding NASA, with advanced research and development programs—that's the genius of the 21st century, providing more funding for the National Science Foundation.

And, yes, we believe in justice. We support full funding of the Department of Justice, with funding for Cops on the Beat, Second Chance, the civil rights division. I will tell you that the message tonight has to be that we don't want to take food from poor people. We don't want to make it harder for low-income students to get a college degree, squeeze funding for research, education, infrastructure. We want to take people off that trash heap of despair and let them walk into glory. Let's support the CBC budget.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask, with the generosity of the gentleman from Utah, how much time do we have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman if he needs it and has additional speakers.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri will control that time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget for fiscal year 2013. This budget should be considered and made in order by all of our colleagues.

Minority communities took the hardest hit during the economic recession. In my district, we suffer rates of unemployment ranging as high as 25 percent and home foreclosures that are significantly higher than the rest of the country.

The CBC alternative budget deals with these issues, helping us to have a skilled, educated workforce that can tackle the 21st century. It increases the maximum Pell Grant award, which we desperately need; invests an additional $25 billion of the President's budget in education and job training; invests an additional $50 billion in job-creating transportation infrastructure projects; and provides an additional $5 billion for the President's budget to help people in our communities with foreclosures.

Mr. Chair, I stand in support of the CBC budget and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, let me close on our side by thanking the gentleman from Utah.

And first of all, let me call attention to one thing, and I think it's important. It may be more important than the discussion of the budget because I think it helps us eventually reach budgets.

Not one speaker on this side called this the Ryan budget. I was in an interview this morning and someone asked me about what I thought about the Ryan budget. And I said, this is the Republican budget. And if I attack the budget, it seems as if I'm attacking the man whose name seems to be attached to it. This Institution is far too important for us to get down into that kind of thing.

We have some real differences in this budget. I believe, and our budget reflects, that budget is an x-ray of our innards. It is a moral document. It tells who we are. And I say, in another position in my life, if you show me your checkbook, I can tell you what you believe in.

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

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

I do appreciate the gentleman's comments, Mr. Chairman, the generosity and the approach that he took that, yes, we should debate the issues, but we don't need to attack the person. I think it is the right attitude, and I appreciate the comments about our chairman, Chairman RYAN.

I remember what Speaker BOEHNER said at the beginning when I started. He said, We may disagree, but we shouldn't be disagreeable. So I appreciate the spirit in which we do this today.

This is a contrast. There is a difference in opinion in the direction that we should go. I fundamentally don't believe that we're just one good tax increase away from prosperity in this country. I think one of the problems and challenges in this Nation is that our government has overreached. It is spending too much money. It is borrowing too much money. And it is regulating too much. Is there a proper role for regulation? Absolutely, absolutely. And where it's a necessity, we need to prioritize it. We need to fix those things that aren't working.

But what we have proposed, as the House Republicans, in our budget is a responsible, bold budget. It's also a realistic budget that, over the course of time, balances the books and pays off the debt. That is the imperative of our Nation. Because, as I sited earlier, we have to leave—we should leave this Nation better than the way we found it; and that means creating opportunity for this Nation to thrive. We need to remember that manufacturing is good in this Nation. We need to remember that, yes, we have to make investments, but to protect our Nation.

I look at the President's budget, and the only thing I see that it cuts is defense; and the only thing it drills is your wallet. I don't believe that that is the direction of our Nation, and that is why we are debating this issue in contrast to the United States Senate which, for more than 1,050 days now, has not even brought a budget to the floor to debate. That is fundamentally and morally wrong. I am proud of the fact that this body is doing this.

I encourage a ''no'' vote on what has been offered as the substitute, but I do encourage Members to vote for what passed out of the Budget Committee. I think it's responsible. I think it's bold. I think it's the right move for our Nation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

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

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

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

□ 2040

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. COOPER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2013 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this 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 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,078,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,318,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,570,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,761,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,922,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,061,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,219,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,388,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,564,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,744,062,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$215,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$232,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$245,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$254,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$271,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$290,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$299,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$319,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$342,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$371,419,000,000.

(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: $2,870,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,946,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,054,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,233,324,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $3,363,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,497,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,688,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,870,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,994,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,162,314,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $2,918,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,976,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,071,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,251,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,354,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,468,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,657,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,826,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,967,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,143,424,000,000.

(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: -$840,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$658,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$501,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$489,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$432,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$407,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$438,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$438,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$403,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$399,362,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $17,078,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,574,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,253,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,916,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,560,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,222,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,873,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,459,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,015,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $12,267,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,994,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,557,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,097,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,574,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,009,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,471,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,933,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $16,342,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,751,000,000,000.

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 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $554,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $562,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $556,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $560,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $562,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $564,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $570,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $559,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $576,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $582,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $588,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $594,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,693,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $45,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $43,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $42,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $45,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $46,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $48,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,551,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,901,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $30,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $30,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,413,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $3,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $3,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $3,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $3,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $3,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $3,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,153,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $35,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $37,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $37,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $38,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $38,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $38,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,092,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,838,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $8,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $9,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $10,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $11,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$11,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $11,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,902,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $60,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $83,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $75,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $77,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $78,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $80,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $80,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $83,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $78,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $90,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,853,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $11,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $11,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,335,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $73,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $72,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $79,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $89,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $93,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $96,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $95,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $95,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $95,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,325,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $372,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $459,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $529,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $557,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $580,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $620,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $655,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $654,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $696,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $695,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $748,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $737,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $775,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $825,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $824,069,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $504,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $554,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $605,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $621,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $641,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $699,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $699,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $747,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $747,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $785,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $858,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,866,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $536,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $529,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $526,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $530,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $524,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $522,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $524,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $537,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $545,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $556,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $571,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,528,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $61,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $67,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,237,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $133,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $134,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $136,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $143,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $141,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $138,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $146,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $149,676,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $150,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $152,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $161,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,726,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $64,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $54,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $55,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $55,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $56,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $56,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $57,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $61,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,220,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,252,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,948,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $344,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $357,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $357,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $395,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $458,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $458,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $526,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $595,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $659,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $715,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $715,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $757,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $757,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $799,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $799,383,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$15,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$13,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$17,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$16,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$20,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$22,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$25,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$28,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$28,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$31,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$31,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$34,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$34,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,242,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$76,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$79,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$96,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$96,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$100,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$100,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$110,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$110,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$115,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$115,265,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $86,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $61,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $42,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $37,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $39,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $41,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,603,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—Not later than April 27, 2012, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit 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 of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $148,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $22,371,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $2,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $51,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $4,270,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $59,490,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $4,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $70,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(5) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $407,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $5,157,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(6) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $600,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $60,400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(7) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A)(i) The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to enact fundamental tax reform that reduce the deficit by $1 trillion relative to current policy through 2021.

(ii) In determining compliance with the revenue instruction the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall calculate deficit reduction relative to the current policy baseline defined in section 403.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report changes in direct spending laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $8,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by $100,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

SEC. 202. DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

(a) SUBMISSION.—In the House, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a bill carrying out the directions set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DIRECTIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following provisions:

(1) REPLACING THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.—The language shall amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to permanently repeal the sequester established under that section consistent with this concurrent resolution for fiscal year 2013, and each subsequent fiscal year through 2021.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include language making its application contingent upon the enactment of the reconciliation bill referred to in section 201.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. 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 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 in the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022. Areas for savings may include, but are not limited to, reducing Medicare fraud, increasing drug discounts, reforming cost sharing requirements, and accelerating or strengthening payment reforms.

SEC. 302. 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 resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

SEC. 303. 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 the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565) or 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 would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2013, the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2017, or the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon:

(1) For surface transportation programs by providing new contract authority by the amounts provided in such measure if the total amount of contract authority does not exceed the additional revenue deposited into the Highway Trust Fund and made available over the authorized period.

(2) Such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Spending limits for total discretionary Federal spending are:

(1) with respect to fiscal year 2013—

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

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

(C) for overseas contingency operations (OCO), $86,192,000,000 in new budget authority;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 2014—

(A) for the security category, $686,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

(B) for the nonsecurity category, $361,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(C) for overseas contingency operations, $61,019,000,000 in new budget authority;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2015—

(A) for the security category, $689,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

(B) for the nonsecurity category, $362,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(C) for overseas contingency operations, $42,667,000,000 in new budget authority;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,057,669,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $38,108,000,000 in new budget authority;

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,066,130,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $37,914,000,000 in new budget authority;

(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,075,725,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $37,807,000,000 in new budget authority;

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,086,482,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $38,734,000,000 in new budget authority;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,097,347,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $39,680,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021—

(A) for the discretionary category, $1,108,321,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, $40,653,000,000 in new budget authority.

SEC. 402. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING OR REPEALING ANY DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that—

(1) increases the amount of any discretionary spending limit for any fiscal year set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(2) repeals any discretionary spending limit set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY RESOLUTION SETTING 302(a) ALLOCATIONS ASSUMED IN THIS RESOLUTION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget or any resolution deeming any budget allocations or aggregates to be in effect, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides for allocations under section 302(a) for any fiscal year that, in the aggregate, would exceed the discretionary spending limit for that fiscal year pursuant to this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST WAIVER OF SUBSECTIONS (a) OR (b).—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a) or (b).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER.—In the House of Representatives:

(1) As disposition of points of order under subsection (a) or (b), the chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is subject to the points of order.

(2) A question of consideration under this paragraph shall be debatable for ten minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for ten minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(3) The disposition of the question of consideration under this paragraph with respect to a bill or resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this paragraph with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

SEC. 403. CURRENT POLICY ESTIMATES FOR TAX REFORM.

For the purposes of section 201, the term ''current policy baseline'' is the baseline, as defined at section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 based on laws in effect as of March 1, 2012, modified to assume—

(1) a permanent extension of the provisions of titles I, II, III, and IV of the Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(2) a permanent extension of the provisions of titles I, III, and IV of the Jobs, Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(3) a permanent increase in the limitations on expensing depreciable business assets for small businesses under section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect in tax year 2011, as provided under section 202 of the Jobs, Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(4) a permanent extension of the Estate and Gift Tax provisions from the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, beginning January 1, 2013; and

(5) a permanent extension of relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax, as defined in section 7(e) of the Statutory-Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, beginning January 1, 2012.

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014, the aggregate amount of advance appropriation shall not exceed—

(1) $54,462,000,000 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 other programs.

(d) 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.

SEC. 405. 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 appropriate levels and allocations in this resolution accordingly.

SEC. 406. 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 first four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 407. 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 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 allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 to 2022.

SEC. 408. 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 included in this resolution.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Any legislation for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations or aggregates of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 504.

SEC. 409. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate of the Congressional Budget Office 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.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a), 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.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Congressional Budget Office shall estimate the change in net income to the National Flood Insurance Program by this Act if such income is included in a reconciliation bill provided for in section 201, as if such income were deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 410. BUDGET RULE RELATING TO 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 of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, or any Act 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. 411. 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 and the 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 2013. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act does 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 2013, 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.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the adjustments shall not exceed the amounts specified in section 501, except to the extent the additional increase is offset pursuant to subsection (d) or by the amount not to exceed a request submitted by the President pursuant to subsection (e).

(d) PERMISSIBLE OFFSETS TO ALLOW INCREASES IN OCO LIMITS.—The discretionary spending limit for the overseas contingency operation (OCO) category for any fiscal year may be increased—

(1) by the amount of any reduction in the security category, nonsecurity category, or the discretionary category, as applicable, for that fiscal year, if the statute making such reduction sets forth the amount of the reduction in such category that is to be used to increase the overseas contingency operation category; or

(2) by the amount of any reduction in direct spending or increase in revenues if the statute making such reduction in direct spending or increase in revenues sets forth the amount of such reduction or increase that is to be used to increase the overseas contingency operation category.

(e) REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENT.—If the President requests revisions for the overseas contingency operation limit set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget by June 30, 2012 to accompany any supplemental budget request for such operations for fiscal year 2012 through fiscal year 2021 with an explanation of strategy consistent with the proposed adjustments, then such adjustments shall not be subject to the offset requirements in subsection (d).

(f) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustment may only be made for spending meeting the definition of overseas contingency operations spending, defined as any operations the funding of which is only used in geographic areas in which combat or direct combat support operations occur, and would be limited to—

(1) operations and maintenance for the transport of personnel, equipment, and supplies to, from, and within the theater of operations; deployment-specific training and preparation for units and personnel to assume their directed mission; and the incremental costs above the funding programmed in the base budget to build and maintain temporary facilities; provide food, fuel, supplies, contracted services, and other support; and cover the operational costs of coalition partners supporting United States military missions;

(2) military personnel spending for incremental special pays and allowances for Service members and civilians deployed to a combat zone; and incremental pay, special pays, and allowances for Reserve Component personnel mobilized to support war missions;

(3) procurement costs to replace losses that have occurred, but only for items not already programmed for replacement in the Future Years Defense Plan;

(4) military construction spending for facilities and infrastructure in the theater of operations in direct support of combat operations; and

(5) research and development projects required for combat operations in these specific theaters that can be delivered in a 12-month period.

SEC. 412. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $315,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration and provides an additional appropriation of up to $751,000,000, and that amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $7,979,000,000 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 $3,132,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates up to $299,000,000, and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 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 $10,000,000, 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 Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives 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. 413. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The following provisions of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) shall no longer have force or effect:

(1) Section 3(e) relating to advance appropriations.

(2) Section 3(f) relating to the treatment of off-budget administrative expenses.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

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

(1) America's tax code is broken and must be reformed.

(2) The current individual income tax system is confusing and complicated, while the corporate income tax is the highest in the world and hurts America's ability to compete abroad.

(3) Tax expenditures are simply spending through the tax code, and cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 trillion annually. They increase the deficit and cause tax rates to be higher than they otherwise would be.

(4) Tax reform should lower tax rates, reduce the deficit, simplify the tax code, reduce or eliminate tax expenditures, and help start and expand businesses and create jobs.

(b) POLICY ON FUNDAMENTAL TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that fundamental income tax reform shall be based on the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Restoring America's Future report including:

(1) lowering individual and corporate income tax rates across-the-board with the top rate reduced to between 23 and 29 percent unless the top rate must be higher than 29 percent to offset preferential treatment for capital gains;

(2) shifting the corporate income tax from a worldwide to a territorial system;

(3) increasing the competitiveness of U.S. businesses;

(4) broadening the tax base by reducing or eliminating tax expenditures;

(5) preserving reformed versions of tax provisions addressing low-income workers and families; mortgage interest for principal residences; employer-provided health insurance; charitable giving; and retirement savings and pensions;

(6) maintaining or improving progressivity of the tax code; and

(7) simplifying the tax code.

SEC. 502. 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. The Medicare Trustees continue to stress the importance of developing and implementing further means of reducing health care cost growth in the coming years. According to the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplemental Medicare Insurance Trust Funds, the official source for Medicare financial and actuarial status:

(A) The Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund will remain solvent until 2024, at which point it would be unable to fully pay all scheduled HI benefits.

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy. Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.3 percent per year, and under alternative fiscal scenario of the Congressional Budget Office, mandatory spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave younger generations burdened with an enormous debt to pay and less health care security in old age, for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(4) Medicare spending needs to be put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program needs to become solvent over the long-term.

(b) POLICY OF MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to ensure the future of the Medicare program is preserved. The Medicare changes under this resolution shall reflect the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report including:

(1) reforms achieving savings within the budget window from policies including but not limited to:

(A) permanently reforming or replacing the Medicare sustainable growth rate with a system that encourages coordination of care and moves toward payment based on quality rather than quantity;

(B) reducing Medicare fraud;

(C) reforming cost sharing requirements;

(D) accelerating or strengthening payment and delivery system reforms; and

(E) increasing drug discounts; and

(2) setting targets for the total Federal budgetary commitment to health care and requiring further structural reforms if the policies in this resolution and other reforms are not sufficient to limit the growth of total Federal budgetary commitment to health care, including mandatory programs and provisions of the tax code related to health care to GDP plus 1 percent.

SEC. 503. 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, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2036, according to the Social Security Trustees Report the combined Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the trust funds in 2036, benefits will be cut 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The current recession has exacerbated the crisis to Social Security. The Congressional Budget Office continues to project permanent cash deficits.

(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) Americans deserve action by their elected officials on Social Security reform. It is critical that the Congress and the administration work together in a bipartisan fashion to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent over 75 years, as certified by the Congressional Budget Office using estimates provided by the Social Security Administration Office of the Chief Actuary. Legislation to ensure sustainable solvency shall reflect the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Restoring America's Future report, which:

(1) achieve the following objectives:

(A) protect those in and near retirement;

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

(C) improve fairness for participants; and

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

(2) include, among other proposals:

(A) moving to a more progressive benefit formula;

(B) providing an enhanced minimum benefit for low-wage workers;

(C) increasing benefits for the elderly and long-time disabled, accounting for changes in life expectancy over the next 75 years; and

(D) gradually restoring the maximum wage base that has slowly eroded.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

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

(1) The Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Reserve, the Government Accountability Office, the Simpson-Bowles Fiscal Commission, the Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force, and ten former Chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisors all concluded that debt is growing at unsustainable rates and must be brought under control.

(2) According to the Congressional Budget Office, if entitlements are not reformed, entitlement spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid will exceed the historical average of revenue collections as a share of the economy within forty years.

(3) According to the Congressional Budget Office, under current policies, debt would reach levels that the economy could no longer sustain in 2035 and a fiscal crisis is likely to occur well before that date.

(7) To avoid a fiscal crisis and maintain program solvency, Congress must enact legislation that makes structural reforms to entitlement programs.

(8) Instead of automatic debt increases and automatic spending increases, Congress needs to put limits on spending with automatic reductions if spending limits are not met.

(9) The budget lacks both short- and long-term spending controls. Greater transparency and the use of spending controls, particularly for long-term entitlement spending, are needed to tackle this growing threat of a fiscal crisis.

(b) POLICY ON DEBT CONTROLS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that in order to stabilize the debt and bring it under control, the following statutory spending and debt controls are needed:

(1) Enforceable statutory caps on discretionary spending at levels set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022, that includes:

(A) separate limits on security and nonsecurity spending and firewalls through fiscal year 2015, and limits on Overseas Contingency Operations through 2021;

(B) a point of order; and

(C) an across-the-board sequester to bring spending back in line with statutory caps if the point of order is waived.

At the end of each session of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office shall certify that discretionary spending approved by Congress is within the discretionary spending caps. If the caps are not met, the Office of Management and Budget would be required to implement an across-the-board sequester.

(2) Establish a debt stabilization process to provide a backstop to enforce savings and keep the Federal budget on path to achieve long-term targets that:

(A) Require at the beginning of each year, the Office of Management and Budget to report to the President and the Congressional Budget Office to report to the Congress whether—

(i) the budget is projected to be in primary balance in 2015;

(ii) the debt held by the public as a percentage of GDP is projected to be stable at 2015 levels for the following five years; and

(iii) beginning in fiscal year 2016, whether the actual debt-to-GDP ratio will exceed the prior year's ratio.

(B) In a year in which the Office of Management and Budget indicates any one of these conditions has not been met, the President's budget submission shall include legislative recommendations that would restore primary budget balance in 2015 or, after 2015, stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio.

(C) If the Congressional budget resolution also shows that one of these conditions has not been met, the resolution shall include fast-track procedures for debt stabilization legislation to bring the budget back within the deficit or debt targets.

(D) If Congress cannot agree upon a budget resolution in a timely manner, and the report of the Congressional Budget Office predicts one of these conditions has not been met, then any Member of the House may introduce a debt stabilization bill, and a motion to proceed to that bill shall be considered on the floor.

(E) Congressional action on debt stabilization action would be enforced by a supermajority point of order against any legislation that would provide new mandatory budget authority or reduce revenues until a stabilization bill has been passed in years during which a budget resolution includes a debt stabilization instruction. The debt stabilization process would be suspended if nominal GDP grew by less than one percent in the prior fiscal year. The process could also be suspended by the enactment of a joint resolution stating that stabilization legislation would cause or exacerbate an economic downturn.

SEC. 505. 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. 506. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

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

(1) The Government Accountability Office 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 Rules of the House of Representatives require each standing committee to hold at least one hearing every four months on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

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

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated. Such recommendations shall be made publicly available.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON A RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as Admiral Mullen, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated;

(2) the Government Accountability Office has issued reports documenting billions of dollars of waste and duplication at Government agencies;

(3) the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Fiscal Commission and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force were correct in concluding that everything, including spending and revenue, should be ''on the table'' as part of a deficit reduction plan; and

(4) any budget plan to reduce the deficit must follow this precept.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the House that in achieving the deficit reduction targets outlined in section 201, the importance of low-income programs that help those most in need should be taken into consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

I believe that we've agreed to divide the time in a different way.

I would like to yield to the gentleman, my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will claim time in opposition, but I will yield half my time, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee will control 15 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a further unanimous consent request. I would like to yield half of my time, 7½ minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio will control that time.

There was no objection.

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

I have the honor tonight of representing the budget that is endorsed by Simpson and Bowles. This is the only bipartisan budget that the House of Representatives will be able to consider in this budget cycle. This is the first time that a Simpson-Bowles budget has been allowed on the floor of the House or the Senate. This is a historic night, and I hope that Members will appreciate this opportunity.

This is one of the most partisan weeks in Washington, and this is the only bipartisan way to solve the Nation's problems. This is the only budget that has a chance of getting through both the House and the Senate. I hope Members will appreciate this opportunity.

Members have expressed interest, but in this partisan week, we've been hammered by forces on both the left and the right, people who do not want America to solve its problems in a sensible and fair manner.

To illustrate what we're doing here, the Wall Street Journal today had a graph of the different budget alternatives.

The top line here is assuming current policies. It is clear trouble for the Nation because we're not reducing the deficit.

The blue line here is the White House budget, which makes considerable progress in solving our problems.

The bottom line here is the GOP plan, which is tough and completely partisan.

There's not a single Democrat in the country that will support that. So it's a budget to nowhere. It's a bridge to nowhere.

In between the White House budget and the GOP plan is the bipartisanship proposal, the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed budget. It's very tough on deficits, it gets the job done, and it gets the job done in a bipartisan fashion.

I hope my colleagues will focus on this budget alternative. We have precious few minutes to debate this, a total of 15 minutes, when the other side had 4 hours. This is a David versus Goliath situation. But I hope not only Members of this body will pay attention, but the public back home, because they want us to solve our problems in a peaceable and fair fashion. They're tired of political bickering. We have the chance in this House tonight to stop the political bickering and pass a good, tough, and fair budget for America.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. I thank Mr. COOPER for his courtesy and his partnership.

I want to begin by saying something nice about PAUL RYAN. PAUL RYAN has got one of the toughest jobs in the country. It's like herding cats to get new guys, old guys, and everybody else to put together the budget that he has for the last 2 years.

However, as Mr. COOPER indicated, his budget is a Republican budget. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget is a Democratic budget.

There's an organization called PolitiFact which sort of checks out what public figures say about certain things. This particular chart, Pants on Fire, was awarded for the biggest lie of 2011, and that was those who claimed that Mr. RYAN's last budget ended Medicare as we know it. It got the distinction of being Pants on Fire for all of 2011.

As Mr. COOPER indicated, we have been viciously attacked from the left and the right; and when you know you have a good deal is when the left and the right are pounding the snot out of you. That's what's happening here today.

So I want to give some Pants on Fire to some of the claims that are being made.

The claim that this creates a path for Medicare premium support, if you're making that argument, your pants are on fire.

This slashes benefits for Social Security recipients. False. Your pants are on fire.

This is a $2 trillion tax hike. False. Your pants are on fire.

Repealing the sequester means $1 trillion in increased spending. False. Your pants are on fire.

This would decimate the defense budget. False. Your pants are on fire.

This encourages tax avoidance by corporations and will ship jobs overseas. Your pants are on fire.

The recession would worsen under Simpson-Bowles. Your pants are on fire.

GDP+1 requires deep cuts in health care, including Medicare. Your pants are on fire.

The Simpson-Bowles budget would decimate domestic programs and force massive cuts. Your pants are on fire.

Anybody that wants to read about it, come see Mr. COOPER or me and we will put your pants out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself 2½ minutes, and I will just do 2½ minutes to close.

First of all, the reason I wanted to yield these gentleman half our time is I don't know why they weren't yielded the same amount of time as the other substitutes were. I don't know why that happened, but it's wrong that it happened the way it did. That's why I wanted to give them those 5 minutes.

I also want to congratulate them for putting a plan on the table. It's nice to see. We don't see that too often these days.

I served on the Simpson-Bowles Commission, and I voted against it. I want to explain why, and I will use the numbers from this budget to show.

Number one, it keeps ObamaCare in place. It keeps PPACA in place. This budget does, too, because it's current law. So unless you rescind it, the spending of it, you're keeping ObamaCare in place, and I have a problem with that health care law. I think it's a bad one. This budget, Simpson-Bowles, keeps it in place.

Number two, it doesn't address the real drivers of our debt, which are these health care entitlement programs. Simpson-Bowles didn't do it. This one doesn't either. To me, you're really not dealing with the driver of our debt unless you do that.

Number three, revenues. Based on the baseline, it has $1.8 trillion in higher revenues. It does mean higher taxes. The last year of this particular budget has higher revenues than the Democratic substitute and the President's budget.

The spending cuts, when you look at the baseline compared to the current law baseline, the one we all measure against here, and you take out the war gimmick, it only has $27 billion in spending cuts over 10 years; by contrast, our budget has $3.3 trillion. So I'm not a fan of the war gimmick. If you take out that war thing, it only cuts about $27 billion off the current law baseline.

It claims that this cuts $4 trillion in deficit reduction. I'm not sure what baseline is being used to do that. But on the current policy baseline, this really only has $2.5 trillion in deficit reduction; 72 percent of that comes from tax increases and 28 percent comes from spending reductions.

I want to simply say amen for bringing a plan to the table. I have tremendous respect for Erskine Bowles and

Alan Simpson and JIM COOPER and STEVE LATOURETTE because they're here being a part of the solution by offering a solution and not being a part of the problem.

I think it goes without saying, but it bears repeating, I just don't like the substance of it. I think it's going to end up pushing people into ObamaCare, whose costs will explode, and I think it's going to be bad for our health care system and it doesn't deal with the primary drivers of our debt. And I don't want to see a big tax increase before you deal with the entitlement programs, because then you're just chasing higher spending with higher revenues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think there's a consensus in America that we have to reduce our deficit. Most it of should be by cutting spending, and some of it should come in revenue contributions from the wealthiest Americans. This proposal does this, so I support it.

I will tell you the other reason I support it. I want our country to have enough resources that a child can get the best education they should. We won't if we don't control the deficit. I want her mother to get a college education and a good job. We won't if we don't control the deficit. I want her grandmother to have Social Security and Medicare. We won't if we don't control the deficit.

If you believe in the progressive things government can do, you must believe and act on reducing the deficit.

This is the best and bipartisan way in front of us. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who actually helped me with the original Cooper-Wolf legislation that helped spawn the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take 1 minute of our time and give it to Mr. WOLF for a grand total of 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

□ 2050

Mr. WOLF. Simon & Garfunkel said in the song ''The Boxer'': ''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.'' I tell the gentleman, I'm opposed to ObamaCare. I voted against it 26 times.

America is in trouble. America is facing economic collapse. We have $15.2 trillion debt, and by the end of this year when you hang your Christmas tree lights up with Christmas tree lights made in China, it will be at $17 trillion. We're borrowing money from China where there are 25 Catholic bishops under house arrest and hundreds of Protestant pastors under house arrest, and we're doing nothing about it. We're borrowing money from Saudi Arabia that funded the radical madrassas up among the Afghan-Pakistan border that led to 9/11, and that led to where we are, quite frankly, with regard to Afghanistan.

When I go into every high school in my district, I ask the young people, Is the Social Security system sound and will it be there when you retire? In the last 3 years, not one has raised their hand. The seniors in my congressional district know more than this Congress, and they know more than this administration. The President has walked away and has failed, and the Congress—both political parties—have walked away and failed.

I commend my friends, Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE, and ask for a ''yes'' vote on the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Mr. Chair, nearly six years ago—during the last Republican House majority—I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address the deficit.

I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. Everything would be on the table for discussion—entitlements, all other spending programs and tax policy—and like the BRAC process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations.

My colleague and good friend JIM COOPER of Tennessee joined me in sponsoring this legislation in 2007 and in subsequent years. It ultimately became the blueprint for the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, more commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called "The Moment of Truth," the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed as well other "sacred cows," including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the President, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The President failed the country. Leadership on both sides of the congressional aisle has done no better. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

Over the past year and a half I have repeatedly said that while there are some changes I would make, I would support a budget proposal similar to or based on Simpson-Bowles if it came to a vote on the House floor. I want to commend Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE today for offering this substitute amendment, which was drafted using the bipartisan principals of the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Simpson-Bowles provides the framework for the most comprehensive and realistic solution to our nation's fiscal problems. I have submitted the preamble of the Simpson-Bowles Commission report for the RECORD, which, I believe, is a worthy read as we debate the Cooper-LaTourette substitute.

Every Member of Congress and the President know the dire economic situation facing our country: a debt load over $15.5 trillion, annual deficits over $1 trillion and unfunded obligations and liabilities over $65 trillion on the books to pay for programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

We're borrowing this money from nations such as China—which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith—and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia—which funded the radical madrasahs on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

We always say we want to leave our country better than we found it, and to give our children and grandchildren hope for the future. Just today, noted historian Niall Ferguson testified before my subcommittee and said that, if we do not change course, the debt burden will not only crush our children and grandchildren but also the current generation in the very near future.

According to the Congressional Budget Office's long term estimate, every penny of the federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending by 2025. Every penny. That means no money for national defense. No money for homeland security. No money to fix the nation's crumbling bridges and roads. No money for medical research to find a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's diseases.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the President must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the President also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

I am—and have been—willing to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren. Every two years I take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. I do not sign pledges to lobbyists or special interest groups.

If the Cooper-LaTourette substitute does not pass today, I will vote to support the Ryan budget proposal so that we may move the budget process forward and continue the necessary discussions to address our nation's financial crisis.

But I hope this substitute passes. It is a balanced and ambitious roadmap to address our deficit.

It also is the only truly bipartisan plan that is being offered, and, I believe, the only plan that has the opportunity to be approved by the Senate.

More important, this proposal calls for difficult decisions by finding savings to completely turn off the Budget Control Act's looming sequestration, which could devastate our defense capabilities.

As I mentioned earlier, I do not agree with every recommendation in the Simpson-Bowles plan. Nor do I support every part of the Cooper-LaTourette substitute. For example, I fully support efforts to repeal and replace the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and regret that Cooper-LaTourette is silent on the need to address this issue. I am also concerned about the instructions proposed for the committee of jurisdiction over the federal workforce. This could impact workers including the FBI and CIA agents serving in Afghanistan, CBP agents stopping illegal immigrants coming across our borders, the VA doctors caring for our veterans, and the NIH medical researchers working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

However, the Cooper-LaTourette substitute is the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we must have. It is the kind of forthright, realistic conversation about our nation's fiscal future in which we must engage across the aisle, across the Capitol and down Pennsylvania Avenue if we are to have any hope of coming up with a credible plan to protect the future for our children and grandchildren.

Every Member should support this substitute.

PREAMBLE

Throughout our nation's history, Americans have found the courage to do right by our children's future. Deep down, every American knows we face a moment of truth once again. We cannot play games or put off hard choices any longer. Without regard to party, we have a patriotic duty to keep the promise of America to give our children and grandchildren a better life.

Our challenge is clear and inescapable: America cannot be great if we go broke. Our businesses will not be able to grow and create jobs, and our workers will not be able to compete successfully for the jobs of the future without a plan to get this crushing debt burden off our backs.

Ever since the economic downturn, families across the country have huddled around kitchen tables, making tough choices about what they hold most dear and what they can learn to live without. They expect and deserve their leaders to do the same. The American people are counting on us to put politics aside, pull together not pull apart, and agree on a plan to live within our means and make America strong for the long haul.

As members of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, we spent the past eight months studying the same cold, hard facts. Together, we have reached these unavoidable conclusions: The problem is real. The solution will be painful. There is no easy way out. Everything must be on the table. And Washington must lead.

We come from different backgrounds, represent different regions, and belong to different parties, but we share a common belief that America's long-term fiscal gap is unsustainable and, if left unchecked, will see our children and grandchildren living in a poorer, weaker nation. In the words of Senator Tom Coburn, ''We keep kicking the can down the road, and splashing the soup all over our grandchildren.'' Every modest sacrifice we refuse to make today only forces far greater sacrifices of hope and opportunity upon the next generation.

Over the course of our deliberations, the urgency of our mission has become all the more apparent. The contagion of debt that began in Greece and continues to sweep through Europe shows us clearly that no economy will be immune. If the U.S. does not put its house in order, the reckoning will be sure and the devastation severe.

The President and the leaders of both parties in both chambers of Congress asked us to address the nation's fiscal challenges in this decade and beyond. We have worked to offer an aggressive, fair, balanced, and bipartisan proposal—a proposal as serious as the problems we face. None of us likes every element of our plan, and each of us had to tolerate provisions we previously or presently oppose in order to reach a principled compromise. We were willing to put our differences aside to forge a plan because our nation will certainly be lost without one.

We do not pretend to have all the answers. We offer our plan as the starting point for a serious national conversation in which every citizen has an interest and all should have a say. Our leaders have a responsibility to level with Americans about the choices we face, and to enlist the ingenuity and determination of the American people in rising to the challenge.

We believe neither party can fix this problem on its own, and both parties have a responsibility to do their part. The American people are a long way ahead of the political system in recognizing that now is the time to act. We believe that far from penalizing their leaders for making the tough choices, Americans will punish politicians for backing down—and well they should.

In the weeks and months to come, countless advocacy groups and special interests will try mightily through expensive, dramatic, and heart-wrenching media assaults to exempt themselves from shared sacrifice and common purpose. The national interest, not special interests, must prevail. We urge leaders and citizens with principled concerns about any of our recommendations to follow what we call the Becerra Rule: Don't shoot down an idea without offering a better idea in its place.

After all the talk about debt and deficits, it is long past time for America's leaders to put up or shut up. The era of debt denial is over, and there can be no turning back. We sign our names to this plan because we love our children, our grandchildren, and our country too much not to act while we still have the chance to secure a better future for all our fellow citizens.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if no one else is seeking time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my friend from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) who, along with Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COSTA, have been invaluable partners in pushing for the Simpson-Bowles budget.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I really commend Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE for bringing this bipartisan proposal forward. It's really time, America, to focus on things we agree on, not things that we disagree on. America wants to see us as uniters, not dividers, in this business down here.

This is the only bipartisan proposal that's going to be offered. It is going to be the framework for whatever deal we come to at the end of this year when we're staring the Bush tax cuts going off and when we're staring extreme defense cuts in the face. This is the proposal, in some form, that will be adopted.

This proposal recognizes there's a balance. It's not perfect. There are some groups that are very peeved at the altar, quite frankly. But this is the only proposal that's bipartisan. It actually addresses the two big drivers. Our revenues are at an all-time low, the lowest since World War II. You're not going to have a vibrant economy without revenue to support our schools, our infrastructure, our transportation, and our economic development.

Yes, the entitlements are a problem. The gentleman from Wisconsin, while he's not in favor of some of the aspects of the health care bill, adapts all of the savings that we did in the last Congress because they're good, efficient ways to improve the life and solvency of Medicare. Medicare is not a problem because President Bush was evil or President Obama was evil. It's a problem that we've got more people and the baby boomers are retiring, so there are less workers to support them at the end of the day, and great health care that's being driven. So we need to get our act together and support this proposal.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to my friend and classmate from New Hampshire, a cosponsor of this substitute, CHARLIE BASS.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. The budget presented by my friend from Wisconsin, Congressman RYAN, is a great statement of principle, and I will vote for it. And I suspect that it will pass the House. But it will not be considered by the Senate. The Senate will not accept or pass appropriations at its levels, and there will be no reconciliation this year.

Mr. Chairman, in 9 short months, the Bush-era tax cuts will end, and taxes will go up by $4.6 trillion, the biggest tax increase in American history. The mindless across-the-board cuts in spending in the sequester will take effect cutting, amongst other programs, defense by over $400 billion. We'll have a vote to raise this Nation's debt with no accomplishments to justify it. We will have to either renew or repeal the temporary payroll tax holiday, and we'll have to complete our appropriations at higher levels than in this budget, the base budget, or face the specter of continuing resolutions through next year.

The American people have heard the debate on both sides, and they are crying for solutions—not squabbling, not posturing or policy brinksmanship. We all have principles. Compromise is not a capitulation of principle. It never has been. All of the great policy accomplishments of our Nation's history have resulted from the willingness of men and women of principle to attack and resolve crises together through negotiation and, yes, compromise. We have that chance tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge Republicans and Democrats to vote for the

LaTourette-Cooper-Simpson-Bowles bipartisan budget tonight and make America proud of us once again.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Pennsylvania, CHAKA FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in support of this bipartisan budget that's being offered that would approach this in a balanced way, that is, with both cuts and additional revenues. It is the basis under which there is a majority support in our country. We have a responsibility to rise to the occasion, and I would hope tonight that we would have Members of this House that could rise above party and do what's right. Let's move the country in a responsible way so that we can continue to make the investments we need so America can live up to its responsibilities to its citizens and to global leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman seek unanimous consent?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. And in the spirit of unanimous consents, I would ask unanimous consent that 15 of those precious seconds go to Mr. COOPER and that he be permitted to yield those 15 seconds as ever how he sees fit.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to a new Member of the House from the State of Illinois, who has cosponsored this substitute at great political peril, quite frankly; and he deserves to be rewarded by the citizens of Illinois and not punished by the special interest groups of the right or left, BOB DOLD.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this. I also want to take the opportunity to thank my friend, PAUL RYAN, for his work on the budget which I think is so critical. As we look at budgets right now, there are not so many of them over in the United States Senate, and when I think about running a business or the families across the country that need to put together a budget, I think it's wrong that the United States Government doesn't have one.

Mr. Chairman, my children were on the floor today. They were here in Washington, D.C.; and when I think about why I came to Washington, D.C., it's because of them, about the American Dream for my children, about providing a country that's better off for them.

We've got $15.5 trillion in debt; we borrow 42 cents of every single dollar. It's time that we put people before politics and progress before partisanship so that we can get something done. It's about providing solutions for our country so that we can come together, have a document that we can use to be able to move the country forward. We need to cut back and rein in spending. We need to be able to provide that certainty for American businesses that are out there.

This is our time. We, Republicans and Democrats alike, have to put the party bickering aside. We have to focus on the solutions that are out there. Am I going to like all of it? The answer is, no, I'm not going to like all of it.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank Mr. LATOURETTE.

The point is simply this, Mr. Chairman, for my children and yours, for the children of the next generation, the time is now. We have to stand up, we have to put together a budget, we have to do so, and we have to find the common ground and move forward. We have to lower our corporate tax rates so that we can be more competitive in the global marketplace. This is our time. I'm asking everyone for a ''yes'' vote on the LaTourette-Cooper amendment.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his leadership and my colleague from Ohio, as well.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1¾ minutes remaining, including his additional 15 seconds; the gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Do my colleagues have any further speakers, or should I start the process of closing?

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. RYAN has the right to close on behalf of the committee, and I am the last speaker on our side. Unless Mr. RYAN wants to give us the rest of his time, we can finish this right now.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'll keep what I have.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On November 2 of last fall, 100 of our colleagues signed a letter, the so-called ''go big'' letter, urging the supercommittee to do the right thing. And let me quote:

> To succeed, all options for mandatory and discretionary spending and revenues must be on the table. In addition, we know from other bipartisan frameworks that a target of some $4 trillion in deficit reduction is necessary to stabilize our debt as a share of the economy.

□ 2100

This is what the Simpson-Bowles budget does, and only the Simpson-Bowles budget.

For those of my colleagues who are worried about certain features of this, do not confuse the Simpson-Bowles report with a budget. A budget is just a framework. It's an outline. It instructs the committees to come up with certain savings, and the committees have the discretion to come up with those savings in whatever way they choose. It's true that the Simpson-Bowles report is one way of achieving those savings, but this is a guide, a target for the committees of jurisdiction.

That's what we must do tonight and do on a bipartisan basis. We must come together for the good of the country. We must put our Nation first. We must set partisanship aside. This is the only way that we can pass a budget in the House and Senate this year, which we must have.

It's easy to be critical; it's hard to perform. Let's make it happen for America tonight. We have an opportunity within our hands to give the United States a budget. All of the other plans are purely partisan and they don't have a prayer. Let's build a bridge to the future. Let's build a real budget that can pass both Houses of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed alternative budget.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Again, I want to thank my partner, Mr. COOPER. I also want to thank all the brave Republicans and Democrats who are going to vote for this, all the brave Republicans and Democrats who cosponsored it, because this is not an easy vote.

Mr. Chairman, the last three elections have been the wildest elections I have seen in my political life. It has swung between party and party and party, and 2012 is going to be the same thing. But I'll tell you what's different. It's not the Democrats are going to take over or the Republicans are going to take over. The mood in the country is: Throw the bums out. Throw them all out and replace them with new people. Americans are screaming for us to take off our red jerseys on this side, to take off the blue jerseys on that side, and put on the red, white, and blue jerseys of the United States of America.

Our proposal, inspired by the Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission, authorized by the President of the United States, has been viciously attacked from the left and the right. And so I think, COOPER, we're on to something.

I want to make an observation, from a pretty famous American, made just a month ago in the Rose Garden down at the White House. The quote is:

> This may be an election year, but the American people have no patience for gridlock and just a reflexive partisanship, and just paying attention to poll numbers and the next election instead of the next generation and what we can do to strengthen opportunity for all Americans. Americans don't have the luxury to put off tough decisions, and neither should we.

President Barack Obama, February 21, 2012.

I have heard a lot of people say that this is hard work, that not now. Well, if not now, when? And if not this, what? Ever?

Mr. Chairman, we're asking that Members tonight stand up, that they stand up to the bloodsuckers in this town that take $5, $10, $15, $25 from our constituents to pretend to defend causes on their behalf. We're asking people to stand up to pledges they had made 20 years ago when we didn't have a $15 trillion deficit owed to China. We're asking people to stand up to honor their pledge that they made on the opening day of the 112th Congress to defend the United States of America from all enemies foreign and domestic. We ask that our colleagues stand up to America's biggest domestic threat and enemy, the $15 trillion—soon to be $22 trillion—that's staring us in the face.

The time is now. We've got to get it done. This is the only bipartisan approach. And this is the only thing that has the chance to be adopted by both parties and the President of the United States, who authorized Simpson-Bowles.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'll close by saying, Mr. Chairman, how I started.

I want to congratulate the gentlemen for just showing a plan and coming together. But I would simply say that the President disavowed this plan already. The Senator majority leader said he's not doing a budget this year, so I don't think anything is passing over there.

I want to reserve the rest of my comments for the substance of this. And I'll reveal the private conversation I had with Simpson and Bowles as to why I was not supporting Simpson and Bowles, as a member of that commission.

This doesn't go big. This doesn't tackle the problem. It doesn't do the big things. You can never get the debt under control if you don't deal with our health care entitlement programs. They're the ones that are the big drivers of our debt.

So, not only in addition to the fact that this keeps ObamaCare in place and it doesn't do Medicare and Medicaid reform—which are essential toward preventing the debt crisis—by repealing the tax exclusion, as Simpson-Bowles plans on doing, purports to do, you're going to cause all of these employers to drop health insurance for their employees and push everybody into the health care law, into ObamaCare, and the costs will explode. So I believe that it will do more harm than good at the end of the day.

I just don't think it's a balanced plan. I mean, if you look at the raw numbers, 72 percent of it is tax increases and 28 percent of it is spending reductions. That, to me, is just not balanced. We don't want to create a new revenue machine for government without getting these entitlements under control. Let's not chase ever-higher spending with ever-higher revenues.

So I appreciate the sincerity and the bipartisanship nature of this, but I just don't think the substance of this bill is right. I think it's going to worsen our fiscal situation by piling people onto the health care law, and it's going to hasten the bankruptcy of Medicare. It's still going to stretch Medicaid, which grows by a third in eligibility, a program that's falling apart by the seams. And I believe these tax rate increases, the revenue increases, will just be used to fuel more spending. That's why I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, on the substance of it.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–423 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. COOPER of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum 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 Acting 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 0, noes 414, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

NOES—414

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Cardoza
Clay
Deutch
Filner
Grijalva
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Larson (CT)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Sewell
Shuler
Towns

□ 2132

Messrs. MANZULLO, DENHAM, CLEAVER, GOWDY, and AUSTRIA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 143, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 143, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 314, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

AYES—107

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lynch
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—314

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Cardoza
Clay
Deutch
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2139

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 144, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 38, noes 382, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—38

Andrews
Bass (NH)
Boren
Boswell
Buerkle
Carney
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa

Cuellar
Dent
Dold
Fattah
Gibson
Himes
Johnson (IL)
Kind
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lipinski
Lummis
Meehan
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Polis
Quigley
Reed
Schrader
Schwartz
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Visclosky
Watt
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—382

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Connolly (VA)
Moran

NOT VOTING—9

Cardoza
Deutch
Filner
Jackson (IL)
Mack
Meeks
Paul
Rangel
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2146

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 145, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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. TIBERI) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting 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. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4281, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–424) on the resolution (H. Res. 600) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 597 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. 112.

Will the gentleman from Kansas kindly retake the chair.

□ 2147

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. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–423 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) had been disposed of.

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,197,368,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,612,409,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,881,422,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,106,522,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,301,143,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,452,783,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,660,783,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,855,297,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,043,898,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,236,911,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$74,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $115,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $156,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $220,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $279,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $291,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $342,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $356,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $353,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $345,788,000,000.

(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: $3,309,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,255,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,353,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,524,427,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,677,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,829,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,044,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,257,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,444,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,698,785,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,287,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,261,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,352,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,532,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,649,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,783,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,998,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,194,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,395,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,657,085,000,000.

(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: -$1,090,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$649,387,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$471,542,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$425,914,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$347,858,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$330,447,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$337,439,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$339,280,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$351,475,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$420,174,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,467,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,240,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,804,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,308,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,733,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,129,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,506,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,867,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $21,223,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $21,621,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,655,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,331,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,787,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,152,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,390,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,577,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,755,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $15,107,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $15,357,000,000,000.

SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $659,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $669,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $532,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $526,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $546,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $528,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $539,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $551,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $560,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $571,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $586,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $574,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $601,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,149,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $73,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $62,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $62,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $64,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $65,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $71,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,005,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $40,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,163,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,693,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $46,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $48,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $48,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $51,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $54,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $55,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $57,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,777,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $17,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $18,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $18,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $18,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,495,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $10,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,044,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $17,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $30,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,616,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $105,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $112,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $119,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $126,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $133,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $130,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $132,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $134,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $137,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $139,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,230,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $26,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $27,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,813,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $215,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $133,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $108,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $113,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $124,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $128,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $133,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $135,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $138,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $141,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,748,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $392,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $383,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $490,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $558,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $605,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $609,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $649,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $687,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $729,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $728,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $784,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $772,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $825,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $823,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $882,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $879,975,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $528,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $553,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $579,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $629,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $648,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $647,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $670,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $670,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $733,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $733,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $786,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $785,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $837,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $837,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $917,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $917,656,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $600,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $589,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $622,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $611,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $620,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $611,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $604,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $607,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $640,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $658,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $655,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $681,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $683,338,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $149,224,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $145,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $156,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $157,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $163,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $162,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $161,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $176,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $181,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $180,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $192,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,089,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $71,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $68,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $70,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $72,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $74,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $77,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $83,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,533,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $27,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,190,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $347,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $361,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $400,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $464,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $532,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $599,375,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $660,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $712,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $712,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $752,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $752,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $794,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $794,191,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.00
(B) Outlays, $0.00
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$77,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$93,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$93,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$97,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$97,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$102,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$102,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$107,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$107,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$109,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$109,655,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2150

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this session of Congress represents a unique opportunity in history to accomplish something great. The pending sequester, the overwhelming number of tax provisions set to expire, and the threat of growing debt must force us to make decisions. Inaction is not an option.

The amendment before us today is more than just a set of numbers. It's a pathway forward. It's a solution. The Progressive Caucus developed the solution by listening to what the American people want. They want shared responsibility and prosperity. They want us to protect the social safety network. They want basic fairness. They want fiscal sanity. That is exactly what this plan provides.

First and foremost, we focused our attention where it is needed the most: job creation. This proposal is estimated to create 3.3 million jobs over the next 2 years because it uses every single tool in the Federal Government's arsenal: One, direct and local hire programs; two, targeted tax incentives; and, three, widespread domestic investments.

Instead, the Republican budget relies on trickle-down voodoo economics that haven't worked before and won't work now. Projections show that the GOP plan would kill 4.1 million jobs in the next 2 years alone.

Americans deserve proven solutions, a growing economy, and financial security for themselves and their loved ones. The Progressive Caucus is listening: We invest in America now and lay the foundation for a globally competitive future.

We need to invest in human capital, education, first-class infrastructure, and cutting edge technologies. This is the kind of thinking that built a successful economy in the past, and it is the real roadmap to prosperity.

Secondly, the Progressive Caucus believes that Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are not up for negotiation. The Republican budget treats our seniors and working families like lab rats, subjecting these important programs to grand conservative experiments.

What the Budget for All proves is that we don't need to put these essential programs on the chopping block. Their assumptions are wrong, and we can do better.

As the primary author of the Budget for All, I'm proud of the transparency of what we put before the American people. What we've released to the public and what we put online is very clear about the policies we stand for and those we oppose.

Instead, the Republican budget focuses so much on what they don't like about the President's proposal that we are left with little details about how they feel they achieve their end goals. It is so scarce on details that The Washington Post referred to it as ''dangerous and intentionally vague.''

It claims lower taxes for all, but there are no real details on how to get there. It claims substantial deficit reduction, but assumes trillions in lost revenue will magically return.

The Republican plan hides the real substance behind their proposals because that is the truly hard part of governing. Being honest with the American people isn't easy, but in these difficult times it's the very least that we can do.

I urge my colleagues to support honest and responsible solutions.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment,

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I want to congratulate the Progressive Caucus on producing a budget that actually addresses our crushing deficit, unlike the President's budget. Their budget produces deficit numbers that are right in line with the House Budget Committee's path to prosperity.

The difference between the two is that the Republican plan reduces the deficit by reorganizing our government services in a much more efficient and streamlined structure, saving trillions of dollars, while the Progressive Democrats would radically increase spending, supported by $6.8 trillion in new taxes over the next decade.

What does that mean in real numbers, $6.8 trillion? It comes to about $22,000 of taxes for every, man, woman, and child in America. That's about $88,000 for a family of four. Don't worry, we're told, we're not taxing working class families, just rich people and corporations.

Let's get a few things straight here. First, it turns out that many of the rich people aren't rich, and they aren't even people. They are small businesses filing under Subchapter S, the very same small businesses that we're depending upon to create two-thirds of the new jobs that Americans desperately need. To whack small businesses with crushing new financial burdens and then expect them to create more jobs is simply absurd.

Second, remember that ultimately businesses do not pay business taxes. Business taxes can only be paid in one of three ways: They're paid by consumers through higher prices; they're paid by employees through lower wages or no wages at all as jobs disappear; or they are paid by investors, mainly pension plans, through lower earnings. That's the only three ways they can possibly be paid.

Let's talk about fairness. In 2008, the top 1 percent of taxpayers, folks earning about $344,000 per year, earned about 17 percent of all income and paid 37 percent of all income taxes. As a class, they are paying their fair share, but the Progressives are right that some individuals within this class pay less than their fair share because of their disproportionate access to tax loopholes. The Progressives rightly want to get rid of some of these loopholes, and that's a good thing. But at the same time, they want to increase loopholes for others. They don't mind the government picking winners among their friends; they just want to do the picking.

The Republican plan calls for the ultimate elimination of these loopholes while lowering overall tax rates so that no American pays more than a third of their earnings to the government. That is fairness.

The underlying problem that's destroying our Nation's finances can be summed up with three simple numbers: 35, 33, and 76.

Between 2002 and 2012, population and inflation combined grew 35 percent. Despite the recession and the recent tax cuts, Federal revenues have grown 33 percent in the same period. Very close.

The third number is what is killing our country. Seventy-six percent is the increase in spending, twice the rate of our revenues, twice the rate of inflation and population growth. By the way, has anybody seen a 76 percent increase in the quality of our roads or our institutions or our law enforcement or our border security? We paid for it, but we're not getting it. That's what's out of control about this administration.

No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

When we're told this is the worst recession since the Depression, I remember a time much more recently when we had not only double-digit unemployment, but double-digit inflation, mile-long lines around gas stations, interest rates at 21½ percent. That was the end of the Carter administration.

Maybe we don't remember those days as vividly. It's because they didn't last very long. We elected Ronald Reagan, whose policies were very different than the current administration. He cut spending as a percentage of GDP. He cut the top marginal income tax rate from 70 percent all the way down to 28 percent. He reduced the regulatory burdens crushing the economy, and he produced one of the most prolonged periods of economic expansion in our Nation's history. This isn't a partisan policy. Warren Harding, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and most recently Bill Clinton all followed similar policies with similar results.

Phil Graham recently estimated that if the economy today had tracked with the Reagan economy, 17 million more Americans would be working right now and income would be $5,700 higher per person.

We need to choose wisely, Mr. Chairman, here and at the polls in November.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman ELLISON.

□ 2200

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, allow me to go right to the heart of the matter. We're talking about budgets and how our Nation shall spend money over the course of years. What we're dealing with now is we're dealing with unemployment, and this budget is no decent budget at all unless it deals with jobs. Now, the Budget for All, which is the Progressive Caucus budget, is all about jobs. We make investments in people developing our workforce, developing education and putting Americans back to work.

America has work that needs to be done. We've got about $2 trillion worth of crumbling infrastructure which Republicans don't invest in. America has jobs that need to be done. We've got people that need to do them, and we have privileged Americans in corporations who have the money that, if they were to give it in the way of taxes as the dues we pay to live in a civilized society, we could combine these three elements to put America back to work.

Now, I'm proud to stand with the Budget for All because it makes the priority of jobs the key thing, but it also invests in America's future and reduces the deficit. We're serious about that. I'd like to make sure that others are, too, and don't just say so.

We've got to put America back to work. The Budget for All does that. We urge support for the Budget for All.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Member from Indiana, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as our national recession near its fourth year, unemployment stays above 8 percent and gas prices continue to skyrocket, our brave men and women continue to serve in harm's way overseas, this Nation is in trouble, and I wonder which of the following choices would Americans choose if they had to pick one. Would it be A, an across-the-board income tax increase? Would it be B, a new tax increase on gas, electricity, and natural gas? Would it be C, a cut in funding for our soldiers to levels that the Pentagon warns is dangerous to our national security?

Now, I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the American people, if given the choice, would prefer to have an option

D, none of the above. But, unfortunately, they're not given this choice in the Progressive Caucus budget. It forces, instead, all three unpalatable options on the American public that is already struggling.

It raises taxes in every income tax bracket to the tune of $4.4 trillion, it raises the price at the pump and on utility bills ever higher by creating a new tax on all fossil fuel-based energy sources, and it makes no attempt to offset the defense spending sequester. And while I do commend my colleagues for making the effort to develop solutions to the Nation's problems and getting specific on those solutions, I think the American people can do better.

We House Republicans have given Americans that none-of-the-above option through our own budget. Our budget responsibly solves our Nation's debt challenges, it responsibly cuts our spending, it avoids a tax increase, and it strengthens programs like Medicare and Medicaid, important to so many Americans. Most importantly, it does so by lightening the burden of government on hardworking American taxpayers, not burdening them with more government.

I respect my colleagues, and urge my colleagues, however, to vote against the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our next speaker, who is the founder of the Progressive Caucus, the proud Congresswoman WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Budget for All rearranges our national security spending priorities in a way that keeps America safe instead of keeping America bogged down in expensive, immoral wars. By bringing our troops home from Afghanistan, we save over $1 trillion over 10 years. We reinvest that money in the American people, their education, their health care, their infrastructure, their retirement security, and their hopes and their dreams.

There's money left over to beef up SMART Security priorities—development, diplomacy, foreign and humanitarian aid—the tools that will truly combat terrorism and protect our Nation in the 21st century.

We get rid of ancient, obsolete Cold War weapons systems that are doing nothing to address today's security threats as well. We also take care of our veterans, and we dramatically reduce our nuclear arsenal.

I urge all Members, read this budget and embrace it, because it truly reflects the values and priorities of the American people—the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Budget for All.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget amendment creates devastating cuts to our Nation's defense. Our Federal Government's primary responsibility under the Constitution is to provide for the common defense for the security of all Americans. This budget amendment causes the Federal Government to abdicate this important responsibility.

This substitute amendment guts the Defense Department by calling for cuts that are $900 billion deeper than the nearly half a trillion dollars that the President already proposed to be cut from the defense plan that he proposed just 1 year ago.

This substitute has no specific plan to replace the sequester, which Secretary of Defense Panetta said would have catastrophic consequences and which would devastate our Department of Defense.

This amendment ignores our constitutional responsibility and tells our troops in the field that, regardless of where the mission is and what state it's in, that we're going to cut all funding. This comes despite the fact that U.S. commanders have made it clear that there will be a continued role for the U.S. in Afghanistan even after Afghanistan security forces assume lead responsibility for security.

This budget amendment also ignores the economic impact that deep defense cuts will have on low- and middle-income Americans that work for the Department of Defense or work for suppliers of the Department of Defense.

Our Nation suffers from a growing number of low-income families and high levels of poverty. We also have more people on food stamps than ever before. This is not the time to cut spending on the one Federal Government function that is specifically called for in our Constitution.

The American people, as you hear from the other side, are looking for fairness. Cutting defense funding, as our colleagues are trying to do here, is not fair to the economic and military security of this country.

This proposed budget amendment, as well as the President's budget, which was soundly defeated a few minutes ago, are not fair for America. What is fair is to set forth a budget which approves the atmosphere for job creation and which stimulates economic growth by relying on Main Street American solutions.

If the Progressive Caucus and the Obama budgets are looking for fairness, they should not be looking to cut the Department of Defense. I urge my colleagues to oppose this substitute amendment so that we can ensure the safety and security of the brave men and women serving our country and for the American workers who support them.

In the alternative, I urge my colleagues to support the House Budget Committee's FY 2013 budget. It is the budget that will restore America's promise, prosperity, and security for future generations.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, next I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, the gentlelady from where there's a there, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congressman HONDA, Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON, and all of the CPC members for their tireless effort on this budget, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and all our members who really put so much time and effort into this. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the Budget for All because the American people must have an honest budget that does not blame the poor for the problems created by the superrich.

The Tea Party Republican budget for the 1 percent does just that. Their budget only cuts programs for our seniors, our children, and our Nation's working poor and vulnerable, while giving away $4.4 trillion in tax cuts for the superrich. And for all of their heartless cuts that end Medicare, hurt our children, close schools, and fire police officers, they don't even come close to balancing the budget because they can't stop themselves from giving away trillions to the special interest Big Oil and the top 1 percent.

I strongly believe that a budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and values. Like the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget is a moral budget, one that invests in the future of all Americans and one that believes that our greatest days lie ahead.

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

Mr. HONDA. I yield the gentlelady 15 additional seconds.

□ 2210

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just mention also, in closing, that our budget also ends the combat operation in Afghanistan. The American people want the war to end. We have decided no more funding for combat operations; there's no military solution. We do provide the funds to protect our troops and contractors and to bring them home safely in an orderly fashion.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is good to get a chance to have this debate that is unique on the House floor, to be able to go through this. Obviously, we look forward to the day that the Senate has this same kind of dialog back and forth on what are spending priorities in the budget. It's now well over 1,000 days since the Senate has had any kind of conversation like this. It's terrific to be able to have this.

There are some areas of this budget that I'd take a look at and I would say I would completely concur with. This budget takes on things like the AMT fix, the alternative minimum tax, and tries to resolve that over time. I think that's a terrific idea, and we need to get a chance to move forward on that. But it does some things that I don't think many people in my district would be in favor of.

Many people in my district look at the tax policy and say it's incredibly complicated and complex. This budget moves the tax system from six tiers to 10 tiers and dramatically increases the complexity of our Tax Code.

It also changes the death tax to a 65 percent death tax. It puts Uncle Sam squarely on the end of coffins, and as the grieving family is there, Uncle Sam is standing there saying, I'm waiting for my cut. I think that's the wrong way to go.

There's a large carbon tax that's included with this. With gas prices going up, energy prices on the rise, I don't think this is the time to also increase the price of energy again in that.

It also raises taxes, ironically enough, on McDonalds and on fast-food places, to be able to punish them, I guess, for supplying food to people that are on the run. It increases taxes on that. It also provides public funding for elections so that people that are running for office, like myself and others, will actually get public funding for that, which many people don't want to be a part of.

It does also provide State flexibility though, but it's State flexibility for a new system of health care oversight. We'd like to see it have flexibility for things like Medicare and Medicaid and such.

So, with that, I would oppose this and would support the House Republican budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from southern California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, this budget is about fairness, where everyone, not just a special few, can succeed.

While the Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee, the Budget for All makes no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security.

While their budget slashes Pell Grants, leaving 1 million students struggling, the Budget for All actually increases investments in education.

While their budget destroys 4.1 million jobs in just 2 years, the Budget for All actually puts 2 million more people back to work by investing in infrastructure.

The Republicans do all this to keep tax breaks for Big Oil and provide an extra $150,000 for millionaires. The Budget for All creates a fairer system by asking those who have benefited most from our economy to pay a sensible share.

The Budget for All ensures everyone can achieve the American Dream if they just work hard and play by the rules.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, we have no more speakers. I will reserve my time until the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, budgets are about priorities, and the Budget for All sets priorities for the American people. It's about creating jobs and opportunity, investing in education, investing in our infrastructure, investing in our future.

The Budget for All, the Progressive Caucus budget, also makes significant investments in our military that actually prepare our defense forces for the 21st century.

The Budget for All is about priorities. And make no mistake, the Republican budget sets completely different priorities. It says to our seniors, we want you to pay more out of your pocket for Medicare; destroys Medicare as we know it; creates a system that's not fair, where young people who want to go to college won't be able to do that because there won't be Pell Grants available for them.

The Republican budget says to you that if you actually want to work hard and play by the rules, that you're not going to be treated fairly.

It's time for us to have a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people, that makes investments in the American people. The Budget for All makes those investments.

I urge my colleagues to read the budget, read the Budget for All, and support the Budget for All, the Progressive Caucus budget that makes important investments in the American people and does not destroy Medicare as we know it.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership, along with Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON.

I rise to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget. I announce today that the Republican budget, according to the Economic Policy Institute, is a job killer—1.3 million jobs will be lost in 2013, 2.8 million jobs will be lost in 2014, and 4.1 million jobs will be lost in 2015.

It will also, in essence, defund the Affordable Care Act, which will eliminate access to health care for many women dealing with reproductive health, dealing with essential health benefits, and also coverage of family planning services. It will cut $1.7 trillion from Medicaid. But the Budget for All will provide a direct opportunity for the School Improvement Corps, the Park Improvement Corps, and Student Job Corps, creating jobs.

It will save TRICARE and personnel. The CBC budget doesn't impact personnel, wages and benefits and pensions for our soldiers, but it ends the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and saves money in doing so.

It extends the earned income tax credit and the child and dependent care credit. It responsibly and expeditiously ends all of our military presence, but, more importantly, it creates an atmosphere for economic improvement and development by providing jobs to our young people, stopping the taking away of the lifeline of Medicaid.

Support the Budget for All. Support the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlelady from California, the songstress, Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

This budget, as a member on the Transportation Committee, would help us to be able to create, once and for all, the infrastructure bank that we desperately needed that would allow us to attract private and public partnership. The Progressive budget would also outline a plan to put over 2 million individuals back to work. And my colleague just before me highlighted what some of those would be. Some of them would include the Improvement Corps for public school rehabilitation projects, Park Improvement Corps for young adults, and Student Job Corps, one of which I was able to take advantage of as a young individual.

Mr. Chairman, the CPC budget will assist us to be able to responsibly act to reduce our budget deficit, but to also maintain our domestic priorities.

This budget is the right budget. It will protect our fragile recovery, and it will invest in our future.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much, Mr. HONDA.

Tonight, I want to commend my friends on the other side of the aisle, starting with Mr. TOM McCLINTOCK of California and those who are with him this evening, because what has happened is that we have begun to see that, between the leaders in the Progressive Caucus and those who can't possibly vote for the Progressive Caucus bill, we are still finding things that we can agree on. For example, is there anybody, the leader of the other side of the aisle, whose group does not believe that we should invest in our children's education by increasing education, training, and social services?

□ 2220

We all agree on that.

Is there anybody on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, who doesn't believe that our budget makes no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits?

These are beginnings of agreements. We all, on both sides, agree that we must responsibly and expeditiously end our military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I congratulate the Member leading the other side.

Mr. HONDA. I yield the balance of my time to our closer, the gentleman from Arizona, the great Raul Grijalva.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Mr. HONDA for his yeoman work on the budget.

The Republican majority is asking the American people to, once more, accept the premise that a trickle-down theory of economics is the path to solvency, balanced budget, and fiscal responsibility. Well, this trickle-down theory, as promoted, all it has done is create a dry opportunity for the middle class in this country.

Unemployment is up, and it has increased the number of poor and unemployed in this country, and this kind of insecurity has led us to the situation that we're in.

Our budget, the Progressive budget, Budget for All, reintroduces something fundamental to the American people, its values and its moral imperatives that have made us a great Nation.

Our budget is about fairness in burden and fairness in all. There should be no privileged group that receives that 40 to 50 of the benefit from the tax cuts. That money is needed in this society, and our budget asks for shared burden and shared responsibility.

We create jobs. We front-load jobs in this. We are about fiscal responsibility, reducing the deficit and balancing the budget; and we, more importantly than anything else, invest in the American people. We invest in our people, our greatest resource.

We save and promote Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid from the destructive plan that's being promoted by the Republican majority. This Budget for All by the Progressive Caucus, we are providing the American people and this Congress with a choice and a contrast. Do we repeat the mistakes of the past and pass a budget that's being recommended by the Republicans that takes us down the same destructive economic path that we've been on?

Or do we go in a direction that promotes equity, fairness, fiscal responsibility, and, more importantly, puts the American people back to work and offers their families the opportunities that we all have been able to benefit?

The Progressive Caucus budget is a budget of choice, a budget of fairness and, above all, returns us to our values as America.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think the reason these times are so impassioned is because we've arrived at a moment when two very different visions of society are competing for our Nation's future, and they're very much reflected in the budgets put forward by the two parties in this House.

America's prosperity and greatness spring from uniquely American principles of individual freedom, personal responsibility, and constitutionally limited government. America's Founders created a voluntary society where people are free to make their own choices, enjoy the fruits of their own labors, take responsibility for their own decisions, and lead their own lives with a minimum of government interference and intrusion.

When someone needs help, we freely give that help, but we ask in return that they make the effort to support themselves to the extent that they can. Our government views no one person or group as more or less worthy than any other.

We are Americans. We'll be judged on our own merits, and we'll make on own choices, including what kind of car we'll drive, what kind of toilets we'll have in our homes, how we'll raise our children, what kind of light bulbs we prefer, what we'll have for dinner tonight.

Today, a very different vision competes for our future, that of a compulsory society, where our individual rights are subordinated to the mandates of government bureaucrats, where innocent taxpayers are forced to bail out the bad decisions of others, and where consumers are compelled to purchase the products or underwrite the losses of politically favored companies.

Under this vision, the purpose of government is not to protect individual freedom, but to improve society, however those in power decide it should be improved, to take from those it declares are undeserving to give to those it declares are deserving or, to put it more succinctly, to take from each according to his abilities and to give to each according to his needs. That's what this is all about.

Not more than 100 steps from where we debate right now, Thomas Jefferson reviewed the bountiful resources of the Nation and asked:

> With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens, a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

This is the Path to Prosperity put forth by the House Budget Committee. And let us be clear: the various Democratic plans, including the one before us now, fundamentally reject these principles and replace them with values alien and antithetical to those that built our Nation.

That is the question that our generation must decide in all of its forms, including the question put to us today by this substitute amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

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

Mr. HONDA. I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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. McCLINTOCK) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting 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. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature on Tuesday, March 27, 2012 to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038—An Act to prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from using nonpublic information derived from their official positions for personal benefit, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 27, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3606. To increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 2012, 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:

5457. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize a 90% guarantee on a supply chain finance facility for The Bank of Nova Scotia; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5458. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize a 90% guarantee on a supply chain finance facility for Royal Bank of Scotland; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5459. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-14, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5460. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5461. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 the semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5462. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Neuse River, New Bern, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0974] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5463. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; New Year's Eve Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0958] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5464. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; M/V DAVY CROCKETT, Columbia River [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0939] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5465. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 14-Mile Railroad Bridge Replacement, Mobile River, Mobile, AL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0969] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5466. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Captain of the Port Lake Michigan; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5467. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0697] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5468. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge operation Regulation; Calcasieu River, Westlake, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1020] received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5469. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conductor Certification [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0035, Notice No. 3] (2130-AC36) received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5470. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30826; Amdt. No. 3464] received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5471. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30827 Amdt. No. 3465] received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 600. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–424). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. OLSON (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 4273. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act and title V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permanently extend the provisions of the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equity Act of 2003; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to the application of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. CONYERS:

H.R. 4277. A bill to establish the National Full Employment Trust Fund to create employment opportunities for the unemployed; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. HURT (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to permit requirements for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10 percent early distribution penalty with respect to withdrawals by unemployed veterans from certain retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. BACA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide that Puerto Rico may be treated in the same manner as the several States for the purpose of carrying out the supplemental nutrition assistance program under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. BERG (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REED, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4282. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and 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 Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require child care providers to provide to parents information regarding whether such providers carry current liability insurance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4284. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 to make it unlawful for a packer to own, feed, or control livestock intended for slaughter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to give members of the United

States Capitol Police the option to delay mandatory retirement until age 60; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4286. A bill to restore and extend the grace period before repayment begins on Federal Direct Stafford loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4288. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide grants to States to assist veterans with who were trained to drive large vehicles while serving in the Armed Forces in obtaining, upon their discharge or release from active duty service, State commercial drivers licenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4289. A bill to enhance the disclosure of information on official foreign travel of Members and employees of Congress, to impose additional restrictions on such travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the income exclusion for discharge of qualified principal residence indebtedness, to provide exclusions from income for certain payments under the National Mortgage Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4291. A bill to establish the United States Commission on an Open Society with Security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H.R. 4292. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish uniform standards for the exchange of controlled substance and prescription information for the purpose of preventing diversion, fraud, and abuse of controlled substances and other prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4293. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude loans made to Main Street businesses from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 4294. A bill to limit the end strength reductions for the regular component of the Army and Marine Corps and to ensure that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy are provided adequate resources in order to meet the National Security Strategy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BACA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H. Res. 601. A resolution expressing support for designation of a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. OLSON:

H.R. 4273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power 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. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states: ''The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states ''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. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 4275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 4278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States)

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 in which Congress has the explicit power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises and Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval forces.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 4280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R.4282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to the power to enter into foreign compacts on behalf of States).

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4284.

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 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Sec. 5, Clause 2: ''Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings . . .''

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4286.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4287.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4288.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 5, paragraph 2 that ''Each House may determine Rules of its proceedings;'' further, in Section 8, Congress has the power to ''pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.''

This legislation is within the powers of Congress because it provides transparent accounting of travels by Members of Congress, thereby reducing the debts incurred to pay for said travels. Moreover, this legislation will promote the ''general welfare'' by promoting the trust in which citizens place in their government to be good stewards of their money.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, as well as clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested in the government of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4293.

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 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 4294.

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 provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 14: Mr. FARR and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 140: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 157: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 192: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 212: Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 303: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 365: Mr. COSTA and Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 376: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 459: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 469: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 547: Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 651: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 742: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 860: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 876: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1004: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1063: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1086: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 1092: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1103: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1130: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1161: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 1193: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1296: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1356: Mr. FILNER and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1370: Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 1385: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1386: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1477: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1515: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 1517: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1532: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1571: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 1575: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 1620: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1653: Mr. BERG.

H.R. 1672: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1733: Mr. JONES and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1744: Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1895: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1960: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2033: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2104: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2195: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2227: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 2234: Mr. FARR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2245: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2299: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 2353: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2479: Mr. FILNER and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 2502: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 2529: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2554: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2787: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2827: Mrs. NOEM, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2866: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2960: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2967: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2978: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. ADAMS.

H.R. 3001: Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. REED, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LONG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YODER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. DENT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3032: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3057: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 3091: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3145: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3173: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3179: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3187: Mr. HECK and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3225: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3269: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3288: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 3341: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 3364: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 3381: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3502: Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 3506: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3526: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3585: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3591: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3596: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3612: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. REED.

H.R. 3635: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3653: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3670: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3705: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3769: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 3770: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3798: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3826: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3828: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 3839: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WEBSTER, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 3855: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3877: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 3884: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3993: Mr. JONES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4032: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4045: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 4087: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4095: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4103: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 4112: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 4114: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. REYES, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4115: Mr. PETERS and Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 4134: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 4136: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 4142: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4156: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 4157: Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 4169: Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 4171: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4173: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4178: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4199: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4209: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4228: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4229: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PITTS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 4232: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4237: Mr. GOHMERT and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4240: Mr. RIVERA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 4251: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 4255: Mr. JONES, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4259: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 4268: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4271: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REYES, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. COLE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POMPEO, and Mrs. BLACK.

H. Res. 111: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 137: Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 351: Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 526: Mr. AKIN, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. SPEIER.

H. Res. 583: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2012 No. 51

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the Prince of Peace, give our Senators this day the grace to move away from divisions. Take from them all cynicism and resentment and anything else that may hinder them from experiencing harmony. May the bonds of patriotism, truth, peace, faith, and love provide the glue that will enable them to glorify You with their oneness. Grant in their hearts the love of Your Name, as You nourish them with all goodness and mercy. May they find in You a faithful guide.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND 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. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, if any, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230; that is, the Paying a Fair Share Act. The Republicans will control the first 30 minutes and the majority will control the next 30 minutes.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I now ask unanimous consent that following the first hour, the time until 5 p.m. today be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and that the time from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. be under the control of the majority, and the time from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. be under the control of the Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Madam President.

At 5 p.m. this evening, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Du and Morgan nominations—prospective judges from Nevada and Louisiana. At 6 p.m. there will be two votes on confirmation of those nominations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2682, H.R. 2779, AND H.R. 4014 EN BLOC

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title en bloc for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2682) to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2779) to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

A bill (H.R. 4014) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to information provided to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object to any further action at this time with respect to H.R. 2682, H.R. 2779, and H.R. 4014.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

NOMINATION OF MIRANDA DU

Mr. REID. Madam President, today the Senate will consider the nomination of a woman by the name of Miranda Du to be a U.S. district judge for the District Court of Nevada. I was very pleased to recommend this woman because she is such an experienced litigator and very proud Nevadan.

Ms. Du has enormous love for the State and this country and a tremendous dedication to public service. Her story is about as inspiring as it gets, and it proves without any question the American dream is alive and well.

Nevada's Asian Pacific population is less than 10 percent. But if confirmed, Ms. Du will be the first Asian American Federal judge in the history of the State of Nevada.

Miranda Du left Vietnam when she was 8 years old with her family in a boat. She was one of the boat people. She was born in Vietnam. She and her family survived the war, and they left. They left voluntarily because they could not get out any other way. I said they left voluntarily—they sneaked

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

out and got on a boat and took off. They wound up in Malaysia. She spent more than 2 years in a refugee camp in Malaysia—this little girl. She was then, with her family, taken to Alabama: Vietnam, Malaysia, Alabama.

When she got there, she enrolled in an American school for the first time. She did not know how to speak English, and that is an understatement. But as a third grader, everyone recognized how smart she was. She picked up the language very quickly. Miranda Du speaks—it does not matter if she had an accent, but she has none—today as well as you or I.

Her family, after living in Alabama—where her father worked on a dairy farm—eventually worked their way to California. She continued to be pointed out as always one of the smartest in any class. She was able to go to college. She got a degree in history and economics from the University of California at Davis and a law degree from one of the finest law schools in the world, the University of California, Berkeley—the famous Boalt Hall. She did well wherever she went to school.

After law school, she moved to Nevada. She joined at that time a law firm McDonald Carano Wilson, which is a very respected law firm. Bob McDonald, the founder of that firm, was a protege of the famous Nevada Senator Pat McCarran, and he was involved in politics. He was a very prominent lawyer until he died a couple years go. Don Carano is also a very well known, famous man in Nevada, a lawyer, and he has done extremely well. He owns major hotels and casinos. He is one of the biggest producers of wine in the State of California. Spike Wilson was a long-time Nevada State senator. They are just a very fine group of people, these three men who started this law firm.

She was made a partner of the law firm in 2002. Her specialty is litigation. She is a trial lawyer and a very good one. She specializes in complex civil litigation and also employment law. She has appeared before the State and Federal courts in all phases of litigation—trial lawyer, an appellate lawyer before the Nevada Supreme Court, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

She has the support of a bipartisan coalition of Nevada officials, including the Governor. By the way, the Governor was one of my appointments to the Federal bench. He was a Federal judge, Brian Sandoval, and a good Federal judge. He resigned that position and ran for Governor against my son, and he won. He is a fine man. He is my friend, and he has come out vocally and very publicly that this woman is a great lawyer and should be on the bench—something he should know a little bit about.

She has received vocal support from the Lieutenant Governor, also a Republican; the mayor of Reno, also a Republican. In fact, Governor Sandoval wrote to the Judiciary Committee to say, Du ''has exhibited great character and is well respected in the legal community.'' He has given her his unqualified support.

Republican Lt. Gov. Brian Krolicki called Ms. Du ''intelligent, inquisitive, reliable and dedicated.'' The Republican mayor of Reno—with whom, by the way, we had a visit yesterday—Bob Cashell said Du ''will be a great addition to our federal bench.''

In addition to being an experienced litigator, she is also an outstanding citizen. She is involved in the northern Nevada community. There are many things she has done, but she served on the Nevada Commission on Economic Development. She has also served as a court-appointed special advocate representing abused and neglected children. She now, and has in the past for a number of years, mentored high school students in Reno, NV. She is a fine example to those students.

I have had the good fortune to be able to forward to Presidents about 10 names, and I have never been more proud of one than Miranda Du. I repeat, if there were ever a success story, it is this woman who was born in Vietnam, took a boat and wound up in Malaysia, came from Malaysia to America, to Alabama, to California, and is now one of the most respected lawyers we have in the State of Nevada. This is what America is all about.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield just for a comment?

Mr. REID. I sure will.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank him for honoring those who came to this country who fled reeducation camps and execution in a most horrible, brutal regime period. The enormous contribution those individuals and their children now have made to our Nation, our economy, our political scene, is remarkable and one of which all of us should be extremely proud. I thank the Senator from Nevada for recognizing those individuals' contribution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is coming from a person who was held for 7 years in a prisoner-of-war camp in that country. So I think anyone hearing this—and there are lots of people watching this—should understand what JOHN McCAIN just said. JOHN McCAIN and I have battled on a number of substantive issues over the years, but I do not think there is anyone—at least I speak from my perspective—for whom I have more admiration and respect than JOHN McCAIN, who has done so much for his country.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I thank the leader for his generous and kind remarks. As he said, he and I have done battle on the honorable field of combat, but I think the feeling of respect and appreciation and admiration is mutual. I thank the leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

LEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if I may just add, the colloquy between the majority leader and my good friend from Arizona certainly underscores once again the extraordinary contribution legal immigration has made to our country for over 200 years. I think of, as an example, my own wife, who came here at age 8, not speaking a word of English. The majority leader was just pointing out an immigrant from Vietnam who has done well. Senator McCAIN has said the same thing that all three of us have said on numerous occasions. So it is indeed something to celebrate.

HIGH GAS PRICES

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday afternoon I came to the floor to suggest that what has been happening in the Senate this week is precisely the kind of thing the American people do not like about Washington.

Gas prices have more than doubled under President Obama and the Democratic-controlled Senate. This is a problem that affects every single American, that drives up the cost of everything from commuting to groceries. Yet the Democratic response is to propose legislation that even they admit does not do a thing to lower the price of gas.

We have seven Democrats, in fact, on record saying the bill does not do a thing to lower gas prices. One of them has called it laughable. But this is apparently the best our friends on the other side can do. It is the most, apparently, they are willing to do. At a time when gas prices are at a national average of nearly $4 a gallon, this is what passes for a response to high gas prices for Washington Democrats: a bill that simply does nothing about it.

But it even gets worse than that because not only is the Democratic solution to high gas prices a bill that even they admit does nothing to lower gas prices, they will not even allow Republicans to offer any amendments that would help. Not only are they pushing a bill that will not lower gas prices, they are blocking any measure that would actually make a difference.

So at a moment when working Americans are struggling with high gas prices, the message Democrats in Washington are sending this week is simple: Get used to it. Get used to it because they have nothing—nothing—but a phony proposal aimed at distracting people from the fact that they have nothing to offer.

Maybe the reason they voted yesterday to get off their own bill is they realized the American people were on to them. Maybe they realized they did not have the political issue they thought they did. Well, my point is that they should be more concerned about helping Americans than helping their own campaigns.

So if Democrats will not allow us to offer any proposals to address this crisis, we are still going to talk about them anyway because Americans need to know there are some things we could do about this issue. We could actually have an impact on high gas prices right here in Congress. They need to hear us debate these ideas, and they need to know Democratic leaders in the Senate will not even allow a vote on any of these ideas.

This whole episode is completely unacceptable. Hopefully, at some point, a number of Democrats will recognize this—will recognize that this should be about more than political games. We ought to actually try to accomplish something.

This issue affects real people. For them, it is an urgent matter. Democrats should summon the same urgency in dealing with it. We were sent here to solve problems, not to hide from them.

KENTUCKY BASKETBALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, something very special in the world of sports is happening in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Kentucky is well known as the home of the Kentucky Derby, often called the greatest 2 minutes in sports. But this coming Saturday, March 31, we will witness one of the greatest moments in Kentucky sports history. Two of the most storied and winningest programs in all of college basketball, the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky, will meet this Saturday in the 2012 NCAA Tournament Final Four. The two teams will face off in a semifinals game in New Orleans, and the winner of that game will contest for the national championship next Monday night.

In my State of Kentucky, the rivalry between UofL and UK is indeed a passionate one. From birth, it seems, Kentuckians are raised to root for one of these two teams; you either wear red for the Louisville Cardinals or blue for the Kentucky Wildcats. The two teams boast two legendary coaches, Rick Pitino and John Calipari. The teams have met every year since 1983, and they have met in the NCAA tournament four times in the past—most recently in the Mideast Regionals way back in 1984. Between them, they have 24 visits to the Final Four. But never have these two teams faced each other in the Final Four with the stakes so high. If the excitement and frenzy and turbulence that has been stirred up in Kentucky could be harnessed, we could solve our energy crisis. Basketball fans from Kentucky have been waiting their whole lives for this game.

On Saturday, we will prove that these two schools have the best rivalry in all of college basketball and that the Commonwealth of Kentucky is the best college basketball State in the Nation.

Let me say that again so my friends in North Carolina can hear it. UofL and UK have the best rivalry in all of college basketball, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky is the best college basketball State in the Nation.

But only one team can win on Saturday.

I am actually an alumnus of both schools. I attended the University of Louisville as an undergraduate, and I went to law school at the University of Kentucky.

I don't know who will win Saturday's game, but whoever the winner is will go on to defeat either Kansas or Ohio State and bring the national championship back home to Kentucky where it belongs. So count me in with my fellow Kentuckians and college basketball fans everywhere as we tune in this Saturday to see history in the making. It is going to be really exciting to watch.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

IMPOSING A MINIMUM EFFECTIVE TAX RATE FOR HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 339 (S. 2230) a bill to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 5 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes, the majority controlling the second 30 minutes, the majority controlling the time from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., and the time from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. to be controlled by the Republicans.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in colloquy with a number of my colleagues for the next 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today, as I have over the last 2 years since the health care law was passed, with a doctor's second opinion. I do that as someone who has practiced medicine and taken care of families across the country—primarily in Wyoming—for a quarter of a century, listening to them, trying to care for them, and knowing that what the American people want is the care they need, a doctor they want, at a price they can afford.

During the last 2 years since the health care law was passed, the American public has found out that now that it has passed, they get to know what is in it, they don't like what they are seeing. Instead of providing patients with the care they need from the doctor they want and at a cost they can afford, they are seeing time and time again a significant change and the promises the President has made broken.

I am here with my colleagues to talk about some of these concerns. I see the Senator from Arizona, who has heard the promises made. I know that when he goes to townhall meetings and talks to people, they have found out that the costs they were promised would go down have gone up instead. The opportunity of patients to keep the care they want and the doctor they want—they are not able to do that. Is that what the Senator from Arizona has been finding?

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague for his continued leadership on this issue and his eminent qualifications to address it and help educate the American people about what is at stake.

I think this colloquy we are having has to be considered in the context of the arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court. I think my colleague from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM, will mention that we should not draw too many conclusions from the questions that are asked by the Justices of the Supreme Court.

One of the things I find when I watch the talk shows—and I ask the Senator from Wyoming this—the first thing they say is that the most important thing about ObamaCare is that parents can keep their children on their health insurance plan until they reach age 26. Well, you know, I think all four of us right now would be glad to put that into law as an amendment in a New York minute. If they want to keep their children home living in the basement until they are 30, that is fine. But for that to be the centerpiece, saying that this is why we have to preserve ObamaCare, is, of course, a bad joke.

What we are arguing about here is the thousands of pages—I guess the Senator from Wyoming knows—is it 100,000 pages of regulations that have been already issued to try to implement this plan?

Mr. BARRASSO. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Also, we have promised to repeal and replace ObamaCare, depending on not only the Supreme Court decision but the will of the people as expressed, perhaps, next November.

Of the areas that I think we have not focused enough attention on, one is the unsavory process that resulted in passage of this legislation—behind closed doors and everybody at Blair House bludgeoning the AMA and the pharmaceuticals and the deals that were cut here.

Another area was a promise made by the President that he would consider—it wasn't committed to, I will admit—medical malpractice reform. And here we are talking about 20 to 30 percent of the health care costs in America which, in the view of some, can be attributed to the unnecessary tests that are being administered and prescribed by physicians and health care providers because of their fear of ending up in court. Yet, in all of this bill, there is not one mention that I know of that has a meaningful approach to medical malpractice reform.

Since the Senator from South Carolina not only is an expert on the Supreme Court, but also he is one of the trial lawyers' Republican favorites, maybe he could address that aspect of medical care as well.

Would the Senator from Wyoming comment on that?

Mr. BARRASSO. I agree with my colleague from Arizona that there are a number of things that continue to drive up the cost of health care. One of the things I believe should have been included in the health care law—I would think we could actually lower the cost of care, lower unnecessary testing, and part of that—all of the studies show—is doing away with these junk lawsuits that result in significant numbers of additional expensive tests being done. It seems to me that we spend more time trying to protect the doctors than trying to help the patients.

Even in a rural State such as Wyoming—and I see my colleague from South Dakota on the floor—this is a national concern and should have been included in any health care law that was supposed to target lowering the cost. That is what the President promised in the beginning, that families would see their health care premiums go down by $2,500 per year. Instead, the premiums have gone up by about $2,100 year.

My colleague from South Carolina has cosponsored legislation to try to give States the opportunities to opt out of a number of provisions of the health care law because they are onerous as to the costs and what is happening in the States and for people at home. If you look at the President's proposals, I would think that any national health care law ought to look at certain components of things that actually bring down the cost of care. With this one-size-fits-all approach and the demand that everyone buy government-sponsored or government-approved health care insurance, the rates are going up instead.

I turn to my friend from South Carolina and ask him about that, plus the unfunded mandates that are forced on the States with Medicaid, which is a significant part of what is being discussed today in the Supreme Court.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be glad to discuss that. I have enjoyed the opportunity to create legislation that would allow States to opt out of Medicaid's expansion under this bill. About 30 percent of the people in South Carolina will be eligible for Medicaid by 2014 when this law is fully implemented. It is the second largest expense in South Carolina. With the matching requirement, we get three Federal dollars for every State dollar you put on the table dealing with Medicaid. That sounds like a good deal until Medicaid explodes in costs and becomes the No. 1 driver of the budget in South Carolina, Wyoming, South Dakota, and Arizona. Under this bill, the problem we have today with Medicaid becomes Medicaid on steroids.

I am confident that there are plenty of Democrats who have Governors who are Democrats who will say: Wait a minute, before you expand Medicaid and put additional burden on my State's budget, see if we can find more creative ways of dealing with it and give people the ability to opt out of that. That would be good policy.

I want to comment about this. One rule of thumb is that any bill passed on Christmas Eve on a party-line vote is probably no good to the country. And that is what happened.

As Senator MCCAIN would say, this was a party-line vote, 60 to 40, on something dealing with one-sixth of the economy.

This was supposed to happen on C–SPAN. President Obama said: I am coming and we are going to change the way Washington works.

If I had to offer exhibit A of what is wrong with Washington, it would be the ObamaCare process. Everything that people hate about Washington resulted in this bill being passed. There was absolutely no bipartisanship; there were behind-closed-door negotiations, beating people over the head to get their support; there was buying votes based on special interest deals for their States. That is not exactly what the American people had in mind. Is it any surprise that something that came out of that process is going over like a lead balloon?

One of the problems with health care is getting doctors to take Medicare and Medicaid patients. What did we do with Medicare? We took $500 billion out of a system that is $33 trillion underfunded to help the uninsured. We have an uninsured problem, but we have a Medicare problem that will be an absolute nightmare.

What I wanted to do on malpractice is to tell a doctor: If you will take a Medicare or Medicaid patient, doing the country a service, and you get sued, we will go to arbitration—require arbitration—and let the panel render their judgment. And if you want to go to court, you can.

That is fair. I want people to have their chance to litigate differences on alleged malpractice. I also want doctors to feel there is an incentive to serve Medicare and Medicaid patients.

What was promised in this bill—the remedies to our health care system—none of them have come true. What you see 2 years later are our worst fears being realized at a faster pace.

The President promised: If you like your health care, you will be able to keep it. What is going on in this country is that employers are dropping health care for their employees because it is cheaper to pay the fine. What is happening in this country is that the idea of being able to expand Medicaid without bankrupting the budgets of this country at the State level, when you look at the consequences, is a nightmare in the making.

We were promised this bill would reduce the deficit. Well, to me, health care includes doctors, and in the bill itself we never dealt with the problem that doctors face of having their budgets, their reimbursements cut. That was not even addressed in ObamaCare. That is a couple hundred billion dollar liability. So the idea this thing has been paid for, as promised, no longer exists. It is adding to the deficit. It was projected to be $900 billion in cost; now it is about $1.7 trillion. So the basic promises around what this bill would do for our budget, what it would do for our choices in health care, have not come true.

I am here to say to our Democratic friends, fix this before it is too late. You will find people on our side willing to meet you in the middle when it comes to reforming health care because it needs to be reformed. But the model you have created—centralized health care—that is going to damage State budgets beyond belief, that will drive private sector insurance out of the market, and it is going to have a budget consequence on top of what we already have is not the right model.

I say to my colleagues here today, I will work with you to do two things: Educate the public about what awaits us if we don't change this bill quickly, and work with our Democratic friends to find a better alternative. I think that is what America wants. When 67 percent of the people, 2 years later, feel this is not the way to go, responsible leadership would say let's alter course.

The Supreme Court may strike down the mandate. They may say Medicaid expansion is a violation of the tenth amendment. I hope they do. But I can say one thing with certainty: Because nine judges, five of whom say it is legal to do something, doesn't make it smart to do something. What is smart is to fix health care in a sustainable way. And what is smart is for Republicans and Democrats to work together in a transparent, open fashion. We haven't done anything smart about health care yet, and I hope that changes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask my colleagues if they remember the Cornhusker kickback? Another Democratic holdout took credit for $10 billion in new funding for community health centers, an exemption for nonprofit insurance in their States; and Vermont and Massachusetts were given additional Medicaid funding; a $300 million increase for Medicaid in Louisiana, and the list goes on and on. This was the process they went through, culminating, as the Senator from South Carolina mentioned, on Christmas Eve—a process that, obviously, most Americans find unsavory.

It is interesting, and I would ask my two colleagues to comment on the fact that the same people, the same organizations—the AMA, the hospitals, the pharmaceuticals, and others, that all signed up and were bludgeoned into supporting ObamaCare—and by the way, that negotiating that took place, since the President promised there would not be lobbyists in the White House, that they would not play a major role, it was done in Blair House—these same people, these same organizations, have come to our offices asking for relief from ObamaCare. Isn't that fascinating. I mean, time after time, the same members of the same organizations that supported ObamaCare come and say, look, we can't live with this provision, we can't do this, it is impossible for us to comply with that provision. It is a fascinating commentary on trying to do the Lord's work in the city of Satan, is it not, I ask my colleagues?

Mr. THUNE. Well, I would say to my colleague from Arizona, he always has a way with words when it comes to describing the strange meanderings of the process here in Washington, but it is.

Unfortunately, all those groups that had access to the process in the end all got sort of kowtowed into going along with it and now they are all being hit with this huge tax bill, because everybody is getting taxed to pay for this. All of it is being passed on, I might add, to businesses in this country, driving up their costs.

But the one thing everyone here this morning has mentioned is who didn't have a seat at the table, and that is the States. Think about the States and what this means for them. Of course, in the first 3 years, the Federal Government said it was going to pay 100 percent of the new population to be covered under Medicaid. But if you look at what happens after that, the States then are starting to have to share or bear more of the burden and be forced to pay at least another $118 billion, according to one congressional report, through the year 2023, which crowds out priorities such as education, law enforcement, and all the things we expect our States to do.

So the States get all these mandates shoved down their throats, making it more difficult for them to bear the responsibilities they have to the people in their individual States because the Federal Government has not only said they are going to have to pay for this, but they have also become very prescriptive about what they can and cannot do. So States are no longer going to have—and frankly, even in the past, haven't had—a lot of flexibility when it comes to setting eligibility standards and determining who can and cannot be covered by Medicaid in their individual States. They just get the costs shoved down their throats, with very little input into how to implement this program, so much so that Governors all over the country are reacting to this, and that is why we have 26 Governors who are part of the litigation that is going on right now at the Supreme Court to challenge the mandate on Medicaid, which will be heard today by the Court.

But listen to what some of the Governors around the country have said—and these are Democratic Governors. This is the Democratic Governor of Kentucky:

> I have no idea how we're going to pay for it.

And, of course, he is referring to these new mandates, regulations.

The former Governor of Tennessee said:

> I can't think of a worse time for this bill to be coming. Nobody is going to put their State in bankruptcy or their education system in the tank for it.

The Governor of Montana said:

> I'm going to have to double my patient load and run the risk of bankrupting Montana.

Those are Democratic Governors reacting to this new mandate that is being shoved down their throat because of the changes that were made to Medicaid in the health care bill. So I think the States, unfortunately, did not have a seat at the table. If they did, they certainly didn't get their voices heard because they are going to be forced now, and people, individuals in these States, to come up with the billions and billions of additional dollars to pay to finance the new mandates in the legislation.

I want to make one other point, because there has been a lot said here on the floor of the Senate, and by people in general in Congress, about the importance of focusing like a laser on jobs and the economy. Frankly, I think there are some things that actually have been done around here. Last week, we finally passed a jobs bill, a private sector jobs bill, that would create jobs, and hopefully make it easier for our small businesses to access capital to grow their businesses and create jobs. But the health care bill, clearly, is going to have the opposite effect.

Interestingly enough, when it passed, there were lots of statements made at the time about how many jobs it was going to create. In fact, if you go back, the former Speaker of the House said it would create 4 million jobs—400,000 jobs almost immediately. That was former Speaker NANCY PELOSI. Interestingly enough, that contradicts what the Congressional Budget Office Director said. He testified the new law would actually reduce employment over the next decade by 800,000 jobs. And analysts at UBS stated the law is ''arguably the biggest impediment to hiring, particularly hiring of less skilled workers.''

So what we are seeing again is a promise made about creating jobs and the very opposite is what we are going to see.

There was a Gallup poll recently that found 48 percent of small businesses in this country are not hiring because of the potential cost of health insurance under the health care law; 46 percent are not hiring because of concerns over other government regulations. But if you look at the impact this legislation is having on hiring in America today, what we are hearing from the people who hire—the job creators out there and the small businesses—this is a huge impediment to hiring.

The device manufacturer Stryker announced they are shedding 5 percent of their workforce over concerns about the impending 2.3 percent medical device tax which was included in the health care law. There is another employer here, somebody who owns a restaurant chain, who stated bluntly, ''This law will cost my company more than we make.''

Another employer in this country said this: ''The new health care law has wrecked our plans to grow our business and create jobs.''

That is exactly the thing many of us predicted would happen, notwithstanding the assertions made by the proponents of this legislation—that it was going to create jobs. We see the very opposite happening. We see our small businesses pulling back, not hiring, not growing their businesses because of the concerns about the costs and the penalties that would be imposed and the taxes that are included in the health care law.

I know my colleague from Wyoming represents a lot of small businesses, as I do. South Dakota and Wyoming are similar in terms of the size of the States and the way people make their living. We have a lot of small businesses and entrepreneurs, and we look to them to grow the economy in our States. Obviously, it becomes much more difficult when you continue to drive and shove these mandates, these requirements, down the throats of our small businesses, these new taxes they are going to have to bear. And the list of new taxes that are going to imposed under this is pretty amazing. It adds up to—and this is just over the cost of the first decade—$552 billion; when it is fully implemented, $1 trillion of tax increases, all of which get passed on in the form of higher costs of health insurance and other costs around the economy.

My point is simply that if we are sincere in being focused on creating jobs in this country, perhaps the biggest impediment, the biggest barrier to that now is the ObamaCare law that is currently being heard by the Supreme Court.

I guess I would ask my colleague from Wyoming to comment on his view with regard to some of these promises that were made regarding this legislation and how actually the bill is now playing out, as we get to know more about it. That is what the former Speaker of the House also said: We have to get this bill passed to find out what is in it. The American people are finding out what is in it and are becoming increasingly convinced this was the wrong direction to go. I assume that is a view shared by the majority of people in Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, it is. And as neighboring States, South Dakota and Wyoming work closely together and are very similar. The experiences we are having in Wyoming—we now have a Republican Governor but previously had a Democratic Governor—as my colleague talked about, with the Medicaid mandates, which were called by one Governor the ''mother of all unfunded mandates,'' is that the money that has to be used for that is crowding out other things, so that is money that can't be used specifically for education. One of the worst things that is happening for education across our country is the health care law, because for every penny the State now has to add to pay for this Medicaid expansion—this unfunded mandate—and I heard the numbers from my colleague from South Dakota, and these are astronomically large numbers—those are dollars that are not going to go to the universities and the institutions of higher education, as well as our additional schools throughout the State. So all of a sudden, if you have a student in college and you see the tuition has gone up much more than you thought it should have—when you likely think it shouldn't go up at all—and you say, why is that, well, it is President Obama's health care law. That is what is happening by mandating money be spent for Medicaid. That unfunded mandate is taking dollars away from education.

This month, in March 2012, a report came out entitled ''The 2011 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid.'' The figures are astonishing on this health spending law called ''ObamaCare'' or the so-called ''Affordable Care Act.'' And by the way, just because you call it that doesn't mean it is affordable, as we see from this report. It drives up Federal Medicaid costs by hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars through 2020. It forces many more people onto the Medicaid rolls.

The President has talked so much and used interchangeably the words ''coverage and care.'' What we know is that across the country, if somebody has a Medicaid card, that does not equate necessarily to receiving care. My colleague from South Dakota talked about reimbursement rates for physicians. Medicaid, in many ways, underpays sometimes even the cost of seeing a patient, so it is harder for those patients to get seen. So I think the President has used two words interchangeably which are in no way interchangeable. Someone can have a Medicaid card but not be able to get care.

The concern is now, as my colleague from South Dakota said, $500 billion of Medicare taken out of Medicare, not to strengthen Medicare, not to increase the security for people on Medicare, not to help improve Medicare but to start a whole new government program for other people. The Medicare patients are having a harder and harder time finding a physician to care for them.

I would say the President of the United States, by using those two words interchangeably—coverage and care—has, unfortunately, misled people to think coverage equals care, and we know it does not. That is one of the concerns with the health care law, as we talked about the broken promises and the unfunded mandates sent to the States.

As I stand with my colleague from South Dakota, I assume when he goes home on weekends—and he does almost every weekend—he hears the same things I hear. When I have a townhall meeting and I ask the question: How many of you believe that under the health care law—remember, the one the President promised your insurance rates would go down $2,500 a year—how many believe that actually, because of the law, your rates are going up faster than if there hadn't been a law at all, all the hands go up. I ask: How many of you believe the quality and availability of your care is going to get worse because of this law? Again, the hands go up.

For a second, I thought maybe that was just something we saw in Wyoming and in South Dakota. But in a national poll yesterday—in the New York Times, of all places—on page A15 of yesterday's New York Times, in terms of the health care law: How will this health law affect you personally? Will this help you? Less than one in five Americans said this will help them. Twice as many said it will actually hurt them. When they asked: Will this decrease your costs, one in six said it would decrease their costs. More than half said it would increase their costs. When it asked, How about the quality of your care, only one in six said they actually expected better quality of care. Many more expected worse quality of care. So it is not just Wyoming, it is not just South Dakota. It is the entire country which is seeing this same impact.

I would ask my colleague from South Dakota, as he travels around, is this what he is seeing everywhere as well?

Mr. THUNE. It certainly is. As the Senator from Wyoming mentioned, the huge majority of businesses around this country—and especially small businesses such as those he and I represent in Wyoming and South Dakota—are enormously concerned about what this is going to do to their ability to create jobs, to maintain coverage for their employees. There are so many huge impacts from this, much of which, frankly, we predicted. But again, the idea or the notion that somehow imposing over $½ trillion in new taxes on businesses in this country, on health insurance plans, was somehow going to lead to lower costs for people to get coverage in this country is beyond me.

I am at a loss to explain how anybody could make the argument this was going to create jobs. Former Speaker PELOSI predicted 4 million new jobs. The Congressional Budget Office had said it would cost us 800,000 jobs. I suspect that is a conservative estimate, based on what I hear from employers in my State and elsewhere around the country.

But I do wish to point out too that in so many ways, because of the new mandates, because of the new taxes, because of the new costs, this is just going to make everybody's lives more complicated and more difficult, including our States. We represent States where our Governors, our legislators work hard to balance our budgets and to live within their means, not to spend money they don't have. Yet here they are being forced by the Federal Government to swallow these additional costs that are coming because of this new health care plan.

Basically, what the Obama administration has done is put shackles on the States when it comes to making decisions about the eligibility needs in their States. They are going to have lower spending on Medicaid providers. In some cases, our States are trying innovative approaches to care and delivery. They are trying to come up with new ways of doing this and to do it more effectively. Yet the Federal Government is going to make that much more difficult.

The bottom line is the combined effect of the ObamaCare's policies has taken power from the States, given more of it to Washington. It has forced unrealistic new spending mandates on the States that are going to crowd out those local priorities the Senator from Wyoming mentioned, such as education, such as law enforcement, the things I think constituents in our individual States expect their Governors and their State legislators to deal with.

Again, I would come back to what these Governors have said, and I am not talking about the conservative Republican Governors in this country. Look at what the Democratic Governors have said. The Governor of Kentucky: ''I have no idea how to pay for this.'' The Governor of Montana basically saying that increasing the patient load under this bill will cause bankruptcy or force him to bankrupt his State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THUNE. Then, of course, there is even the Governor of a State such as California, which I will submit for the RECORD.

But the point is, there are lots of promises made that haven't been kept with this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

BIG OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk about what is the pending business before the floor, which is my legislation to end Big Oil subsidies in this country.

Middle-class families are hurting, struggling to make ends meet. Yet today we are on the floor of the Senate fighting an uphill battle against those on the other side of the aisle who, with one hand, would continue handing out $24 billion in wasteful subsidies to five of the biggest, most profitable oil companies in the country and, with the other hand, take away vital programs from our Nation's veterans, its seniors, disabled children, just to name a few.

We hear our Republican friends talk about balanced budgets and we hear them talk about austerity. We hear them saying we all have to tighten our belts, we all have to make hard choices on Medicare and veterans and veterans' benefits and student loans, just to name a few. Yet they will not, in that austerity or shared sacrifice, say we will end unnecessary tax breaks to Big Oil. They will continue to ask the same things they have asked a thousand times before, which is that the American taxpayers subsidize the richest five companies in the world, while we cut programs for our wounded soldiers, for our seniors, and for our students.

Some people think of budgets just as boring documents with lots of bewildering numbers. In reality, they are statements about our priorities. This debate draws the brightest lines between our priorities and theirs. The Romney-Ryan budget, for example, cuts $2.2 billion in education for children with disabilities. What do they say to these parents? I guess they justify it by saying we can't afford it.

Why is it we cannot afford it when five companies that collectively made $137 billion in profits last year alone are getting $24 billion in subsidies over the next 10 years? So we tell these children on the Romney-Ryan budget they cannot be helped to fulfill their God-given potential because we can't afford it, but we can afford to give these five companies that made $137 billion in profits—not proceeds, profits—that we should give them an additional $24 billion of our taxpayers money? I don't think so.

Here is another example. Republicans are proposing cutting $13 billion per year from the SNAP program—that was formerly called the food stamp program—for families who do not know where their next meal will come from. So laid-off workers may not be able to feed their families, but our Republican colleagues will ensure that big oil companies continue to stuff their face at the taxpayer trough and they make sure no subsidies are cut that will hurt the bonuses of the big five oil companies' CEOs.

Here is one of them, Rex Tillerson, the CEO of ExxonMobil. He made nearly $29 million in 2010. How is it we can afford to protect Mr. Tillerson's pay but not a program designed to help hungry children? Why is it we need to protect those who need it the least but take it from those who need it the most?

Another issue we keep hearing from the other side is that cutting these subsidies will somehow raise gas prices. The notion that gas prices will go up is only in Washington. Anyplace else in this country, they get it. But only in Washington are we hearing from the other side that cutting subsidies will somehow raise gas prices. The notion that gas prices will go up if we end subsidies to Big Oil is nothing more than Republican snake oil, and the American people aren't buying it.

Let me put it plainly. We are subsidizing these companies to the tune of over $2 billion per year. Collectively, just these five companies—not talking about other sized producers. Just these five companies made $137 billion last year. Can anybody, with a straight face, tell the American people that they could not live with $135 billion in profits, that they could not give up their $2 billion; and, therefore, if they could only live with $135 billion, they wouldn't need to raise gas prices a dime—unless they are so greedy that $135 billion is not enough in profits that they need, out of each and every taxpayer's pocket in this country, another $2 billion to add to their profits.

Yesterday morning I heard one of my colleagues on the floor ask why are we picking on the poor oil companies when everyone gets the same tax deductions. So I took out my 1040 tax form to look for myself, and I was looking, let's see, for intangible drilling costs. No, I don't see it in my 1040 form. Tertiary injectants, I don't see it in my 1040 form. So I guess not everyone gets the special tax deductions for drilling.

There is a tax deduction Big Oil gets called domestic manufacturing deduction. When Congress was contemplating that provision, Big Oil, through their legion of lobbyists, managed to convince many on the other side of the aisle that drilling for oil was somehow manufacturing. When we think of manufacturing, we think about creating a product. I don't know about you, but being able to call drilling for oil manufacturing seems like a real special tax break to me.

As I said yesterday in this Chamber, it is time to get back to reality, the type of reality middle-class families face in this country, the type of reality middle-class families face as they go to the pump, as they have to get to work, take their children to school, to doctor appointments, the type of reality small businesses face when they are trying to send their sales force across a State and have them traveling in a car to do so. It is time to tell middle-class families struggling to make ends meet that fairness means everyone pays their fair share when it comes to reducing the deficit and that it also means it is time to stop wasting taxpayer moneys on oil subsidies and use this money to invest in clean energy, in jobs, in lowering the deficit. It is time for us to repeal the Big Oil tax breaks. It is time for our colleagues on the other side to join us to end this corporate welfare for big oil companies, to create competition to help lower gas prices and to reduce the deficit rather than continue to sell snake oil to the American people to protect Big Oil profits.

I have listened to some of the debate. I don't get it. I have seen average Americans who are struggling, and they say: Wait a minute, $24 billion of our money is going to the big five oil companies and they are making $137 billion? As a matter of fact, that is just 1 year. The $24 billion we want to eliminate and put into renewable energy fuels would create competition, will ultimately help drive down gas prices, to reduce the deficit significantly, instead of calling upon cuts to children, whether in their nutrition or cuts to children who are disabled. I only talked about $137 billion in 1 year. We want to cut $24 billion over the course of 10 years. Guess what they will make in 10 years—over $1 trillion in profits. I find it hard to fall for the crocodile tears that taking $24 billion over 10 years, a little over $2 billion a year, when they are going to make $1 trillion over a decade is somehow not enough, that leaves them with not enough profits—$24 billion from $1 trillion—and that because we take that $24 billion, gas prices are going to go up.

All these subsidies have not made gas prices go down. As a matter of fact, as I pointed out yesterday, at a time when they were making $137 billion in profits, they were producing 4 percent less oil. Come on. It is time to give working families in this country a break. We can do that as we vote to end Big Oil subsidies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we continue the discussion about the impact of high energy prices, high gasoline prices at the pump, what they mean to families from Alaska to New York—the very reality we face as a nation that is struggling still, coming out of a recession. We are worried about jobs. We are clearly worried about the high price of energy and what can be done. I think it is important to note this is something to which there are no clear and easy answers. There are no short-term, quick, flip-the-switch fixes we can do. But there are a lot of things we can help to make happen by either affirmative action or, in many cases, getting the government out of the way.

In doing so, I think it is important we speak honestly about the situation before us, about what the potential solutions are and how they translate. In the past day or so, I have heard some comments from some of my colleagues that I think deserve a fair and honest rebuttal so this conversation, the dialog, can continue and be better understood in terms of what we are talking about with these oil and gas tax increases—because that is exactly what the Menendez proposal would do. It would increase the taxes on an industry that is providing not only much needed resources for this country but much needed jobs.

The first point I have heard is that American taxpayers are, somehow or other, subsidizing the oil companies. Again, it is important to put this in context. This argument I think rather bizarrely labels basic tax deductions, somehow or other, as a subsidy, as though the Federal Government allowing businesses to retain more of their earned dollars—because that is what is happening with the situation of the oil companies; they have earned the dollars and they are basically keeping more of the dollars they have earned—that, somehow or other, that action is the equivalent to handing them a check from the government; whether it is what we see, for instance, with the situation at Solyndra, where they got a check from the government. It is important to put in context that when some say we need to end subsidies for oil companies, I think what that translates into is raising taxes on oil production.

I think it important to note and understand this is an industry that does pay substantial taxes to the Treasury. Their taxes are already higher than we see in most other industries. The four largest companies have an effective tax rate that is over 40 percent. In 2010, they paid $55 billion in income taxes to Federal, State, local, and foreign governments. That is a huge sum. It probably increased, along with the oil prices, back in 2011. These numbers are from 2010. But when people say we all need to pay our fair share, I think it is important to ask the question: How much does the industry have to pay before it is sufficiently considered to be doing its part?

One of the other points of contention that has been raised by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that raising taxes on oil companies will not increase gas prices. Well, it is certainly not going to lower them. I think we can probably agree on that.

If we raise taxes on oil production, we are going to get less oil production, and it is a question that I think we need to ask. Think of any situation where if we tax it more, we will have more of it, and it will be more affordable. It just doesn't make sense here.

Both the President and the sponsor of the legislation before us have publicly stated that more production can help lower prices. Loss of oil production due to punitive taxes—I think we have seen this play out time and time again. Back in the Carter administration they advanced a failed windfall profits tax.

I mentioned yesterday on the Senate floor the example that we are seeing play out in Great Britain right now. One year ago the United Kingdom decided to do essentially what is being proposed here. They reacted to high oil prices by raising taxes on the industry, and the net result was companies produced less, and they diverted their investment elsewhere.

In the year since the UK imposed its tax hikes, the production decline has tripled from 6 percent to 18 percent. They are now looking at reversing that decision and have announced new oil tax breaks to try to bring back that production.

Another point that has been raised is that somehow or other oil companies are getting special treatment, and I just mentioned this a little bit. Again, the four largest oil companies have an effective tax rate that is over 40 percent. What that means in terms of where they stack up with other industries—this is a higher effective rate than in most other industries that we would see there.

Another point that has been raised is that oil companies are not investing their profits in more oil production. The President seems to disagree with this statement, arguing that the United States is producing the most oil it has seen in years. But the reality is, efforts to produce oil here in this country have been blocked or slowed by the Federal Government seemingly at every turn. Again, I think it is important to put this in context in terms of where we are seeing increased production because that part of the discussion is true. We are seeing increased production but not necessarily on our Federal lands.

On this map of the lower 48, the Federal lands are all these areas in yellow. The red dots are Federal shale well operations on Federal land. The blue is the shale well private land operations. So we have a situation where 96 percent of all production increases have occurred on our States and on our private lands. This comes from the administration's own EIA that we have seen production on the Federal side drop under this administration. The fact that exists is that America's largest untapped oilfields—whether they are in the offshore areas, the mountain west, Alaska, which is not even on this map—are still off-limits under Federal law. None of these resources are counted when people say the United States only has 2 percent of the world's reserves.

I showed a chart yesterday that indicated we are not even allowed to count these areas that have not been truly proven. It is because of the lands being off-limits or the permitting delays that we see that the United States is not a larger producer of oil. If the Federal Government wanted to, it could allow us to become the world's top oil producer and be virtually independent of OPEC sources.

A fifth point that deserves some comment: Yesterday, the majority leader said for every 1 cent increase per gallon of gas, Big Oil profits rise by $200 million. Presuming this figure is true in the general sense that it has been alleged, I think my Democratic colleague appears to prefer that perhaps those profits should go to OPEC rather than to U.S. companies or to the pension holders. At least in the United States those dollars are taxable. They support jobs—including 9.2 million jobs within the oil and gas industry—and help us with the balance of trade issues. So, again, that is a contention that needs to be directed, some commentary.

Another point is that America is now a major or net exporter of oil. This was raised yesterday by the Senator from California when I was on the Senate floor. She said: We are now a major or net exporter of oil. That statement is absolutely false and needs to be corrected. Under 15 CFR 754.2, it is illegal to export crude oil from the United States without a rare and very special waiver. Therefore, 99 percent of the oil that is produced here stays here. Ninety-nine percent of the oil produced in this country stays in this country. Only 1 percent of U.S. oil is exported.

The very small, very insignificant exports of crude that do occur require a very extensive review process. It is typically sent to Canada or Mexico for refining purposes. Ultimately, that fuel is returned for use in the United States.

In terms of exporting refined products, if that is the concern, Secretary Chu came before the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee and stated that the only refined product exports from the United States consist of certain types of diesel fuel and products we don't use in the United States. So that is a big difference between refined product and crude.

But it is important to correct the record and demonstrate that we are not in a situation where, as a country, we are exporting our crude oil. It is totally inaccurate to say the United States is running a surplus or acting as some major exporter of any of the fuels which Americans need and use to fill up their vehicles or heat their homes. As a result, almost 90 percent of refined products stay in this country. Pretty much the only products that are exported are those products we don't use.

The last and final point I would like to make is about a statement that was, again, made yesterday that somehow or other Republicans only want to drill, and they are not interested in renewable energy. Again, I think that statement is a false one and needs to be corrected.

I come from an oil-producing State and certainly believe very strongly that we need to also focus our efforts on renewable energy. Republicans are simply proposing that we pay for renewable energy research and development without raising taxes on employers and consumers.

I have been pushing for years to allow for revenues from the development of ANWR to help us build out that next generation of energy source for our country. ANWR revenues alone could provide as much as $300 billion in Federal revenues for renewables—depending on what the price of oil is—if Democrats would simply allow access to it. Instead, they propose to raise taxes on whatever production is taking place and hand out loan guarantees, unfortunately, to many unstable companies.

I would also point out that allowing the Keystone Pipeline has nothing to do with drilling. Neither does pressing the EPA to settle down with its regulations that are making refineries so expensive to operate and in some cases actually shutting them down. I think most Republicans also support the new CAFE standards and many of the other renewable provisions that were in the energy law passed in 2007. This Congress has passed multiple efficiency and renewable bills out of the Energy Committee. Unfortunately, none of them have been allowed a vote on the floor of the Senate.

So I think it is wrong to suggest that Republicans are not willing to talk about anything but drilling. We just want it included in part of that discussion when we are talking about ''all of the above.'' I think we absolutely need to mean all of the above, and that includes increased domestic production and it includes a strong future for renewables. It must focus on conservation and efficiency. This is how we will get to a true level of energy independence and reduce our energy vulnerability on our insecurity.

With that, I know my time has expired. I would ask unanimous consent that the time during all quorum calls be divided equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, a week or so ago I came to the floor to talk about the general issues of gasoline prices and domestic energy production. I believe it is important for us to use accurate facts as we are talking about our energy challenges and we work on energy policy issues. Only by using actual facts can we identify policies that will hopefully bring down the price of gasoline at the pump.

So I would like to focus on a particular aspect of our domestic production; that is, production on federally owned land. This is something which has been the subject of a lot of political discussion, both out on the Presidential campaign trail and to some extent in the Senate.

Let me first comment with respect to the price of gasoline and the impact of domestic production on the price of gasoline. This chart, which I put up before, ''U.S. oil production and gasoline prices during the period 1990 through 2011,'' I think, makes the point very well. That point is that the price of oil is set on the world market. What we produce domestically does not have a significant effect on that market. So the red line on the chart represents increases and decreases in domestic production of oil and the blue line represents the price of gasoline. Clearly, there is not a lot of correlation between those two. It is worth looking again at this chart because I think it makes the point that as U.S. production has increased from 2009 to the present, oil prices have also increased. So increased production has not resulted in lower prices, and it cannot, because the price of oil is set on the world market and the price of gas is, in effect, pegged to the price of oil.

Increased domestic production, while important for our country—and it is important for many reasons—does not bring us lower gas prices. Our policy approach must be to find ways to use less oil and be less dependent on the volatility we see in the world oil markets. We know how to do that. We know how to decrease our vulnerability to those world oil markets and we have made some, in my view, enlightened policy steps to accomplish that. We got a good start in the 2007 Energy bill. It was a bipartisan bill, and that bill requires the use of more biofuels; that is, homegrown energy which is not traded on a world market. We require the use of those biofuels in transportation. We require that vehicles of all sizes be more fuel efficient. We have seen dramatic results from that, and we have hopes for even greater results in the future.

This next chart shows the real progress we have made in reducing our reliance on imported oil. It was about 60 percent in 2005; it is now down closer to 45 percent in 2011. The Energy Information Administration projects that this progress will continue and their projection is that under current law, if we do nothing else, imports should drop to around 38 percent of our oil consumption by 2020. I, for one, hope we are able to do some other things and bring that dependency on foreign oil down even more.

One way to continue that improvement is to support the expansion of our renewable fuels industry and support efficient vehicle production. In the context of our debate about energy tax policy, we must use some of our limited taxpayer resources to encourage a diverse supply of both energy and fuel. Promoting homegrown advanced biofuels and highly efficient alternative vehicles needs to remain a priority for our country.

Yesterday we had a hearing in the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure, the purpose of which was to explore how the exploration of a number of tax incentives directed at advanced biofuels and at energy efficiency and at renewable energy has affected those industries. I hope very much that we can find a way to work together to keep those incentives in place and continue to make progress in developing these alternative ways to meet our energy needs.

Unfortunately, there are those involved in these discussions who persist in focusing almost entirely on how to increase domestic production instead of on any other policy that could help us to use less oil. While we know domestic production will not significantly impact gasoline prices, at the very least when we discuss domestic production, I think it is important to get the facts right.

There is an ongoing misunderstanding or misstatement of the facts about the production of oil on federally owned land. Let me address that for a bit. One of the Republican candidates stated last week in the context of gasoline prices that ''[p] roduction on government lands has gone down under Obama.'' Indeed, he went on to suggest—without any basis I could determine—that increasing domestic production of oil would reduce the price of oil by $1.13 a gallon. How he came up with that number I have no idea, but it is important that we all work from the same facts.

Here are the facts: It is undisputed that overall domestic production of oil has increased, not decreased, over the last 3 years. We are showing a chart that makes that point. This chart shows that during the 3 years of 2006, 2007, and 2008—the last 3 years of the Bush administration—we produced 1.78 billion barrels of oil. During the first 3 years of the Obama administration—2009, 2010, and 2011—we produced 2 billion barrels of oil. One of the witnesses we had in a recent hearing in the Energy Committee was James Burkhard, a managing director of IHS/Cambridge Energy Research Associates, and he described our situation in this country as the ''great revival'' of U.S. oil production.

Over the last 3 years, the U.S. increase in oil production was far greater than that in any other country in the world. The United States is now the third largest oil producer in the world after Russia and Saudi Arabia. This trend is also true for the subset of domestic oil production which we would define as federally owned resources; that is, oil production on Federal land. This chart I think illustrates that very well. Production on federally owned land is higher in every year of the Obama administration than it was in the previous administration.

Between 2006 and 2008, as I said before, we had a total of 1.78 billion barrels of oil produced on Federal land. Between 2009 and 2011, the total is over 2 billion barrels being produced on Federal land.

Secretary Salazar testified to the Energy Committee recently that oil production from the Federal Outer Continental Shelf increased by 30 percent between 2008 and 2010. Offshore production decreased somewhat between 2010 and 2011 because of the BP disaster in the gulf, but it still remained higher than it was in 2008, and that production, of course, is increasing substantially again in 2012.

The Energy Information Administration suggests that clearly the decrease experienced in 2011 in offshore production was due to the Deepwater Horizon disaster. It projects that domestic oil production will increase over the next 10 years, in part due to ongoing development in the Gulf of Mexico. The projection is that it will increase by over 1 million barrels per day as compared to 2010. Annual oil production onshore on Federal lands has increased by over 8 million barrels between 2008 and 2011 and is now over 111 million barrels.

Oil production has always fluctuated a bit from year to year on Federal lands and on private lands. There is no doubt that will continue to be the case. The important point here is that we need to put to rest once and for all the claim that the Obama administration is causing a reduction in production of federally owned resources. That simply is not the fact.

We should also be aware that the industry has access to a great deal of productive Federal acreage that it has not yet developed. This chart is instructive. This shows total federally owned acres leased for oil and gas development as of 2011. We can see there are 74 million acres that are currently under lease. This is Federal land currently under lease, both onshore and offshore. The striking thing about this chart is that roughly 25 percent of this is actually being produced—producing oil and gas at this time. There are many reasons for that. I am not accusing anyone of not diligently pursuing this; I am just saying there is a lot of land under lease, a lot of area under lease that is available for production, and I assume the companies that have leased it are aggressively pursuing that production.

This final chart I wish to share with my colleagues covers the number of acres offered to industry for lease on the Outer Continental Shelf, all of which were in the resource-rich central and western Gulf of Mexico and the number of those acres actually leased. As we can see from this chart, the blue area is the area that was offered for lease but not purchased and the red is the area that was actually leased. The administration, of course, has announced they will have another lease sale in the Gulf of Mexico—in the central and western gulf—and this will cover 38 million initial acres. So there is a very substantial amount of land being offered for release.

It is useful to keep in mind that federally owned oil production today is about 37 percent of our total domestic production. Many of our oil resources are located on private lands or State lands and resources from all of these areas are important in meeting our energy needs.

We need to produce domestic oil and produce it responsibly. There are a lot of good national security and economic reasons for that. I have always supported doing that. But to suggest that some change in policy regarding domestic production is going to change the price of gasoline at the pump is disingenuous. In order to move toward policies that will work to moderate the impact of gasoline prices in the future, I think it is important we be honest with our constituents and ourselves about what the factors are that influence that price.

We enacted some policies in 2007 that have been helpful. I hope we can build on that work at a time and on an issue of such great importance to the future of our country. I hope we can work together and stick to the same facts. If we do that, I believe we can develop and enact policies that can provide real help in the long run to our constituents who are suffering from high gas prices.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam 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. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 25 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I voted against the motion to proceed to the Menendez bill on Monday because, quite frankly, it is just a bill to continue raising gas prices. I talked for quite some time yesterday on the Senate floor about this; that by raising taxes on the oil and gas industry it sounds good to a lot of people because people do not like the oil and gas industry. They have been vilified, so everybody thinks we ought to get the oil and gas industry.

What they do not understand is—I think they understand it, but they will not admit it—that is the way to increase prices at the pump. Somebody has to pay for all that stuff. So even Senator MENENDEZ and several Democrats have said this bill is not going to lower gas prices. It would raise gas prices. I do not think anyone who looks at it logically could come to any other conclusion.

As I discussed Monday on the Senate floor, the Democrats' plan goes against everything we know about basic economics—higher taxes limits supply. Whenever we limit supply, the price goes up. I do not think there is a person out there right now who does not remember, back in their elementary school days, the basic concept of supply and demand. We have this huge supply out there. But if we cut the supply, then the demand is going to be greater, and the prices are going to go up.

The bottom line is, President Obama and his allies do not have an answer to high gas prices. That is because high gas prices—higher prices for all the energy we use—are exactly what they want. This administration remains committed to a cap-and-trade, green agenda. It is a plan that severely restricts domestic development and drives up the price of gas and electricity.

Let me put it another way. Their policies are designed to make recoverable traditional energy more expensive so their desired green energy can compete. There is no question that is what the Obama administration has wanted.

You all remember—and we have quoted so many times on this Senate floor—that Steven Chu, the Secretary of Energy, told the Wall Street Journal: "Somehow we have to figure out"—speaking on behalf of President Obama and the Obama administration; not so much the Democrats in the House and the Senate, but this is the Obama administration—he said: "Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe." Well, the levels in Europe were ranging, at that time, when he made the statement, around $8. Well, we are getting up there. He is getting his way. This is something that is happening now.

We all know the infamous quote from President Obama in 2008 when he said under his cap-and-trade plan—this is a quote now—"electricity prices would necessarily skyrocket." Notice the word "necessarily." It is going to happen. The President had it right. The point of the cap-and-trade regulations is to make us pay more on our utility bills.

A lot of times people do not draw the connection. Energy is energy. If we raise the price of energy on utilities, on utility bills, or gas prices at the pump, it all relates to the rest. If we somehow put coal out of business so we have to use more natural gas and more gas, then that raises the price because that makes more demand for that particular product. I think most people understand that. That is very basic.

If we are serious about lowering prices at the pump, then we need to open the vast oil and gas reserves we have at home to develop. After all, CRS recently reported—this is kind of interesting because it was a CRS report; so far, I have not heard anyone counter this report—we have more recoverable reserves of oil, gas, and coal than any country in the world—more than Saudi Arabia, more than China, more than Canada, all of them combined.

In fact, with more than 160 billion barrels of recoverable oil, we have enough to maintain America's current rate of production and replace all of our imports from the Persian Gulf for 50 years. That is just domestically what we could do. It is out there.

A lot of them try to say: Oh, no, we only have 2 percent of the reserves. I have said this so many times, and yet the other side just keeps repeating it over and over: We only have 2 percent of the reserves, and we are using some 25 percent when, in fact, they are talking about proven reserves. Proven reserves are reserves where we have drilled and proved there is oil there. Recoverable are the areas where we have not drilled yet because we have not had an opportunity.

So if we have a policy, as this administration has, not to allow us to drill for oil, then we cannot prove anything. So the 2 percent means absolutely nothing. It is totally false. The thing is they know it. The key is ''recoverable.'' We have more recoverable reserves in fossil fuels; that is, oil, gas, and coal, than any other country in the world.

But today we have awful government regulations that prevent us from accessing it, and we are the only Nation that does this. I defy anyone to tell me the name of another country that does not develop its own resources. They all do it, and we have this President saying, well, we encourage them down in Brazil and Venezuela to drill but not here.

Well, anyway, we have these reserves that we need to start doing something with. That is why I have submitted three amendments that will address President Obama's war on affordable energy. I am going to talk about them.

First of all, amendment No. 1974 is the American Jobs and Domestic Energy Production Act. In order to increase the development of our wealth of resources, I have submitted a substitute amendment to this bill that will open literally billions of barrels of oil and gas for commercial development. It is something that will actually bring down the prices, directly bring down the price of oil, of gasoline at the pump.

First, the bill opens significant portions of the Outer Continental Shelf for development. Right now, the entire east coast and west coast and much of the Gulf of Mexico are completely off-limits. For the most part, the only offshore development allowed is in the western portion of the gulf and in certain areas offshore of Alaska. But we have to keep in mind, to do this, we have to get the permits, and that is where they have dragged their feet.

My amendment would require the rest of the OCS to be leased over time. According to a recent study, these areas have at least 63 billion barrels of recoverable oil and up to 186 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Once brought fully online, this will create tens of thousands of new jobs and ultimately may bring in an additional $1.4 trillion in additional tax revenue for the government.

My amendment would also require the administration to move forward with three lease sales that were conducted by the Bush administration but were subsequently pulled by the Obama administration after taking office.

Additionally, my amendment allows ANWR on the Northern Slope of Alaska to be developed. Experts believe this area contains 16.4 billion barrels of oil and 18.2 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I have been up there. People talk about ANWR and all this, and it is a beautiful area. They have systems now where we cannot even tell where they are developing it. I have seen polls ranging from 70 to 85 percent—and I can actually identify these polls—of the people in Alaska, they want to do it. Why are we, in our infinite wisdom in Washington, DC, telling them in Alaska they cannot go after their own oil and gas?

I think it is ludicrous. Anyway, this amendment will correct that situation.

My amendment removes also the statutory moratorium on the development of this resource, and it requires the Secretary of the Interior to begin an oil and gas leasing program in that area.

Today, oil shale—particularly that in Western States—represents some of our greatest energy potential. Just a few years ago we didn't know this. We didn't have any idea of the size of this.

Some experts believe the Western States hold as much as 1.8 trillion barrels of oil shale, of which 800 billion barrels is presently recoverable. This is simply an astonishing amount of oil, and it would do a lot to help lower the price at the pump. That is what we are talking about. Everything we have talked about on the floor in opposition to the Menendez bill is something that will lower prices of gasoline at the pump.

My bill forces the administration to release 10 research and development leases that were approved by the Bush administration but then canceled by the Obama administration.

Thereafter, the Obama administration would be forced to conduct additional oil shale leases on Federal lands. We have 93 percent of the Federal lands that are off-limits. That needs to be corrected.

Lastly, my bill reserves the right of regulating hydraulic fracturing to the States. I know a little bit about this because the first hydraulic fracturing that took place in this country was in my State of Oklahoma in 1949. Since 1949, there has not been one documented case of groundwater contamination. It has worked beautifully, I think most people agree, now that it is better regulated by the States. The States differ in the depth of their resources, what they have to do to achieve it. It has worked. The old saying is ''if it ain't broke, don't fix it.'' We have to look behind the motive of the Federal Government. This administration, if they can stop hydraulic fracturing, can stop the production of oil and gas. I believe that is their motivation. It is a State process that is successfully regulated by the States, and in 60 years there has not been one documented case of groundwater contamination.

Because States have done such a good job regulating fracking, I think they ought to continue having that exclusive right. My bill does this. It takes away the temptation of the power grab by the Federal Government to regulate this thing that doesn't need to be regulated at the Federal level, particularly when their motivation is to do away with hydraulic fracturing. If we do that and we talk about when they are trying to go after these types of formations, they cannot extract 1 foot of natural gas without using hydraulic fracturing.

That is what the bill does. It would be a big win for energy production because we all know the administration's regulations would likely prevent anybody from ever using hydraulic fracturing again. I can remember when the President was giving his speech to the Nation at the joint session. All of a sudden, people caught on that he has had this war on fossil fuels. He started saying complimentary things about good, clean natural gas. I agree. But what we didn't hear him say—because he said it so fast toward the end of his remarks—is we have to do something about hydraulic fracturing. If we kill hydraulic fracturing, we cannot get the natural gas we are talking about.

All told, by tapping into our domestic supply of oil and gas, we could increase our economic output by trillions of dollars over the next several decades. It could increase government tax revenues by $2 trillion, and it would create hundreds and thousands of new well-paying jobs.

We have the energy resources we need, and if we develop them, it will significantly improve our economy and, there again, lower the price at the pump.

By raising taxes, as the Menendez bill would, it would only make the problem worse. I urge adoption of that amendment.

The next amendment I introduced is the Gas Regulations Act of 2012. To hold the Obama administration accountable for their role in gas prices, I am also introducing the Gas Regulations Act of 2012 as an amendment. We actually have this, and we are going to try to introduce it as a bill. This amendment would require an interagency committee to conduct a cumulative analysis on certain EPA rules and actions that impact the price of gasoline and diesel fuels.

My amendment is the companion amendment to a bill introduced last week by House Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman ED WHITFIELD. This amendment will help us to obtain a better understanding of the costs of all these levels of regulation. I have often talked about the regulation and what the cost is. It is kind of masquerading. I will read the cost of these regulations that this administration is accountable for and that directly relate to the increased price of gas at the pump. Tier 3 motor vehicle emissions and fuel standards—that would levy a $12 billion gas tax on refiners. Who will pay for it? You will and my wife will at the pump. New source performance standards for petroleum refiners could result in billions of additional environmental and compliance costs. Again, that will be passed on to the consumer. The RFS2 standards too would force Americans to consume 21 billion gallons of expensive biofuels, such as the one the Navy procured for $26 a gallon last year, instead of paying $3.50 a gallon.

Ozone standards would result in a $676.8 billion loss in GDP. Again, these standards increase directly the price of gas at the pump. There is greenhouse gas PSD and title V permitting actions—again, another regulation. This regulation slows down the permitting process and would prevent upgrading refining capacity from coming online quickly. Again, this causes an increase in the gas price. People know pretty much the supply-and-demand argument, but they don't know what the regulations do. Anyway, this amendment No. 1963 is designed to do that.

The next one I introduced is amendment No. 1967. This is kind of called the Inhofe-Upton Energy Tax Prevention Act. FRED UPTON, a Congressman, actually passed this. I have introduced this now for 3 years. We have been trying to do this.

Just yesterday, we found out President Obama fully intends to make good on his campaign promise that under his plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity prices would ''necessarily skyrocket.'' That is what we are talking about with this amendment, cap and trade. People remember that. A lot of Republicans were concerned about this issue after Kyoto, and they said let's do something about this; this idea that somehow we are going to have to reduce and regulate greenhouse gases in order to do this. They are introducing cap-and-trade bills. It goes back to the Kyoto convention in 1993, when the famous meeting was held, and Al Gore went down to try to put it together in Rio de Janeiro 20 years ago. He was going to put this together to come up with an international convention called Kyoto, and they tried to, of course, get us to pass it. We saw it would cost the American people between $300 billion and $400 billion a year, and it would treat developing countries differently, so we didn't do it.

The interesting thing about the Kyoto treaty is that the President—then President Clinton—never submitted it for ratification in this body. After that didn't work out, they went ahead and did a second effort to do it through cap-and-trade legislation. We beat all the cap-and-trade regulations. The main reason is because it became evident the science was cooked—all put together by the United Nations. It started back in 1992. They developed something called the IPCC, which is the Intergovernment Panel on Climate Change, which was designed in order to, I believe, cook the science and make people believe we are going to have to do something and that CO_2 and anthropogenic gases were causing global warming.

We know what happened since that time, and with climategate, which showed they cooked the science. Consequently, we introduced this legislation. This legislation merely does one thing. It will take away the jurisdiction of the EPA to regulate greenhouse gases. My concern is this: We were able to stop all these bills from passing that would have imposed a tax increase on the American people.

To give an idea how much that $300 billion or $400 billion would mean, in Oklahoma, I keep track of the number of families who file tax returns, and I do the math. If we do the math with what it would cost for cap and trade and do the legislation they were talking about passing, which we defeated on the Senate floor, it would cost each taxpayer in Oklahoma over $3,000 a year. What would they get for that? This is interesting. Even those people out there who think I am way off base and wrong, in terms of CO_2 and anthropogenic gases—keep in mind we asked the question to President Obama's Administrator of the EPA: ''If we were to pass cap and trade, would this reduce CO_2 emissions worldwide?'' She said: ''No, logically, it would not.''

This isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China and in India. Those are the places where they would have to be regulated. But they don't regulate it to the degree we would here. We can carry that one step further. If we pass cap and trade, it would have the effect of increasing anthropogenic gases worldwide, because as our manufacturing base leaves the United States and seeks energy in those areas where there are less controls, that would have the effect of not reducing but increasing emissions.

What we would attempt to do is to take away that jurisdiction. Here is the reason we want to do that. It is bad enough—when I talked about $300 billion to $400 billion it would cost to do cap and trade through legislation, if we do it through regulation, it will be a lot more for this reason: Most of the bills that were introduced, starting back in 2003, ending up with the Waxman-Markey bill, which was a couple years ago, these were bills that would regulate emitters that emitted over 100,000 tons a year. However, if we do it through regulation, it has to be under the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Air Act specifically says not those that emit 100,000 tons a year but those who emit 250 tons or more. That would be every church, every school, and every hospital in America. We cannot even approximate that cost. That is what doing cap and trade by regulation would do.

Simply put, my third and last amendment would be to do here what they have already done in the House of Representatives, which is to take away the jurisdiction from the EPA. It directly relates to the price of gas at the pump. Take these three amendments, and if the Menendez bill should get through, with these amendments we can totally stop the increase of gas at the pump because that is what we will be faced with if we adopt the Obama-Menendez amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEVIN). The Senator from Tennessee.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATE MAJORITY LEADERS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last Wednesday, I had the privilege, as did many in this body, of attending a tribute to two former majority leaders of the Senate, Howard Baker and Bob Dole. It was a great evening. President Clinton sent a video and the Vice President attended, as did the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and all former majority leaders of the Senate, except one. It was a long evening but a good one. Along with Senator Baker was his wife former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, and along with Senator Dole was his wife former Senator Elizabeth Dole. It was sponsored by the Bipartisan Policy Center. It was a reminder that while in this body we have differences, in fact, this body was created to resolve differences. People sometimes say to me: You Senators argue. That is what we are supposed to do. When they kick over to us issues that cannot be resolved other places, with respect for each other's points of view, we try to resolve them, and we often do. Well, Bob Dole and Howard Baker were among the best at working across party lines and getting results, and it was for that skill as much as for any other skill that they were honored.

I was asked to introduce a short film about Senator Baker, and I did. Senator ROBERTS of Kansas was asked to introduce a short film about Senator Dole, and he did. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my remarks about Howard Baker as I introduced the film.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. My job tonight is to introduce a short film about Howard Baker, but I want to do that the way he would do it with a story. I was thinking that—I believe the very last time I appeared anywhere with both Senator Baker and Senator Dole was almost exactly 16 years ago. It was just before the Tennessee Republican primary. Bob had run me clean out of the presidential race. I was trying to do the only graceful thing, which was to support him.

And so Howard held a press conference at the Knoxville Airport, and I did what I thought was a good thing to do. I presented Bob Dole with one of my red and black plaid shirts and my endorsement, whereupon Howard Baker said loud enough for everybody in the news media to hear him: I hope that's Lamar's last red and black plaid shirt.

Howard Baker loves a good story. He especially loves a story about his maiden address. He spoke a little too long. His father-in-law, the late Senator Dirksen, walked over to congratulate him. And Howard said, well, Senator Dirksen, how did I do? And Senator Dirksen looked down and said, Howard, perhaps you should learn to occasionally be guilty of an unexpressed thought.

From that he learned eloquent listening.

My favorite story of his was when he suddenly found himself the majority leader after the Reagan sweep in 1980, and no one was more surprised than him except Bob Byrd, who suddenly found himself the minority leader.

So Howard went to see Bob Byrd, and he said, Senator Byrd, I'll never learn the rules of the Senate as well as you know them. So I'll make a deal with you. I won't surprise you if you won't surprise me.

Senator Byrd said, let me think about it. But he called him the next morning and said yes, and they worked beautifully together for four years, effectively, with the Senate.

Senator Baker, when he was the chief of staff to President Reagan, every single morning—so he tells me—would begin his day with the president sitting down, just the two of them, each of them telling the other one a little story. That got to be a lot of stories. But it always made me feel a lot better about our country to know we had a president and his chief of staff who were so secure in their own skin that they could sit down at the beginning of each day and tell each other a little story. That was one of Howard Baker's secret weapons.

His other secret weapon is that he remembers Roy Blunt's advice: People start getting into trouble when they stop sounding like where they grew up.

Howard Baker has never stopped sounding like where he grew up, because he never stopped living where he grew up, the little town of Huntsville, Tennessee.

Earlier this week a student asked me, what's the best way for me to get into politics?

And I said, I can tell you exactly how to do it. Pick out the person you admire the most, volunteer to go to work for them without any pay, carry their bag, drive them wherever they want to go, baby-sit their children, write their speeches for them, even if they don't give your speeches. I know that works, because that's what I did. I did it for the very best. And 45 years ago, I went to work in the United States Senate for Howard Baker, in the very same office that I occupy today.

So I agree with Senator Dan Quayle, who once said, there's Howard Baker, and then there are the rest of us senators.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, Senator Baker, recalling the story of his maiden speech, asked that his remarks be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The story was this, which I told that night:

Senator Baker was here in 1967 and made his maiden speech at a time when his father-in-law, Everett Dirksen, was the Republican leader. I was here then, as Senator Baker's young legislative assistant, right out of law school. Senator Dirksen walked over to Senator Baker and sat down next to him after what had been a fairly long speech—maybe 45 minutes. Senator Baker looked at his father-in-law and said: Senator Dirksen, how did I do? And Senator Dirksen said to his son-in-law Howard: Maybe occasionally you should enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought.

So Senator Baker, recalling that advice, I assume, asked that his remarks to be delivered that night at the end of a long ceremony be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator Baker's remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER

A CENTURY OF SERVICE HONORING HOWARD BAKER AND BOB DOLE

THE MELLON AUDITORIUM

WASHINGTON, D.C.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2012

REMARKS BY HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

When I first arrived in Washington as a newly-elected Senator in 1967, the Vietnam War was at its height, with no end in sight and with anti-war protests growing increasingly violent.

Race riots were burning down American cities.

A president of the United States had been assassinated just over three years earlier, and there were more assassinations to come.

It was a dangerous time in America, and many of us feared the center would not hold.

We came to Washington as the last of the World War II generation to seek public office. We had been, in President Kennedy's words, "tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace," and we sought positions of leadership to help heal the Nation we had sworn to defend as very young men and women.

Bob Dole, a genuine hero of the Second World War, had already come to Washington six years earlier as a Congressman from Kansas, and he would join me in the Senate two years later.

George Bush the elder, another young hero of the war, was elected to the House the same day I was elected to the Senate.

The overwhelming majority of members of the House and Senate in those days had served their country in uniform, most of us in war.

We had a perspective on political conflict that today's leaders cannot have.

We knew what it was like to be a nation totally at war.

Most of us were old enough to have suffered through the gloom of the Great Depression that had gripped our economy for more than a decade.

And now our country was being torn apart by an unpopular war, by racism, by extremism, by violence.

We were no less committed to the success of our political parties and the supremacy of our policy objectives than the leaders of today.

Indeed, we understood profoundly that the vigorous contest of political ideologies and policy ideas lay at the very heart of a successful democracy.

We knew that it was through those contending interests, passionately but peacefully pursued, that the full range of the American people's demands and dissents could be properly addressed, and sound public policy could emerge from this constitutional crucible.

But we also knew that none of us had a monopoly on truth, or wisdom, or the best interests of our countrymen.

We had—and we kept throughout our Washington careers—a decent respect for differing points of view.

Without this respect, democracy cannot work. With such respect, with good will toward our adversaries even when political passion is most intense, democracy cannot fail.

The abundant harvest of this philosophy is plain to see.

In our time of testing, we replaced race riots with racial justice.

We won the Cold War.

We saved Social Security from bankruptcy and created a social safety net that rescued millions from poverty and desperation.

We created economic policies that led to the most sustained and widely shared prosperity in the history of the world.

In much worse times than these, President Lincoln told his deeply divided countrymen, "We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies."

This is the credo of the Bipartisan Policy Center, which does great honor to Bob Dole and me tonight.

This is the secret of America's success.

This is the foundation of America's democracy.

And this is my fondest wish for the country I love.

Thank you, and God bless us all.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks on the subject we are debating here, which is energy.

Last week the majority leader said he was disappointed that we were not moving to the Ex-Im Bank and to postal reform and to cybersecurity, all of which he said are urgent national issues the citizens of the United States expect our Senate to deal with. The Republican leader said that, on our side, we are ready to deal with all three, and the Republican leader offered to join the majority leader in dealing with the Ex-Im Bank, with a few relevant amendments. That might be a pretty good way to begin our process of getting the Senate back to doing what the Senate is supposed to do, which is to bring up important pieces of legislation, allow Senators on both sides to offer their amendments, speak on them, and then vote on them. It is easier to do if the amendments are relevant to the legislation that is being offered.

So we were looking forward this week to dealing with a postal reform bill, which needs to be dealt with. We have a several-billion-dollar debt for the post office, which has been a part of our lives ever since our country was founded, and we have competing pieces of legislation on the issue, with very good Senators on both sides of the aisle ready to discuss it. Yet, suddenly the majority leader changed his mind, which he has a right to do, and instead, he brought up legislation repealing six tax provisions for five oil companies—provisions that, for the most part, are tax provisions that are similar to those available to most other companies in America.

Why would the majority leader do that? Well, in the Senate it is not considered to be good form to inquire into the motivation of other Senators, and I won't do that, but I will read a paragraph or two from The National Journal this week that speculated on what might have happened this past Monday evening. I quote:

The Senate holds a procedural vote this evening on legislation sponsored by Senator Menendez of New Jersey that would repeal tax incentives for the country's biggest oil companies. It won't pass, but it will create a platform for Democrats to try to reclaim the debate on gas prices. Indeed, a memo circulated over the weekend by John Podesta, president of the liberal Center for American Progress, and Democratic pollster Geoff Garin, notes that the vote ''offers a huge opportunity for progressives to frame energy policy through the gas price debate.'' Democrats will use familiar tactics of linking high gas prices to Big Oil, and Big Oil to Republicans, with the aim of attacking GOP presidential candidates and of putting three vulnerable Republican Senators up for reelection—Scott Brown of Massachusetts, Richard Lugar of Indiana and Dean Heller of Nevada—in tough spots.

That is the end of the speculation from the National Journal.

Now, maybe that was the reason the majority leader decided to bring this up, but clearly we are spending a whole week on a political exercise. If this is true—that it is being brought up to frame an issue to put Republican Senators who may be running for reelection in a difficult spot—well, then the Republicans must not think so because we all voted to bring it up. So instead of doing cybersecurity or postal reform, we are spending a whole week on something we all know is not going to pass and is a misuse of the time of the Senate. It would be much better if we were using the time on those other issues.

But as long as we are discussing lowering gasoline and fuel prices, I have a suggestion to make. Here is a plan to lower fuel prices: Double energy research. And here is a way to pay for it without adding to the Federal debt: Stop wasteful, long-term subsidies that are exclusively or mostly for both Big Oil and Big Wind.

Look at shale gas. The Senator from Oklahoma was talking about shale gas, which is being produced thanks to new technology found through energy research. This is a remarkable development in our country. But, as Daniel Yergin, the leading expert on energy, reports in his new book ''The Quest,'' the innovation on this began over 20 years ago, some of it from the private sector, some from government funding. Basically we found a way to find natural gas and oil through a process called hydraulic fracking. It is possible all around the world. I was in Australia in January, and they are doing it and selling it to China. The remarkable difference for the United States is not just that we suddenly have a lot more natural gas but that it is cheap gasoline. Instead of being $15 a unit, which it was when we passed the last Energy bill in 2005, it is $2 a unit or $3 a unit.

More than that, while Australians are selling their gas to China and paying the world price at home for their own natural gas, in the United States it appears likely we will be able to buy our gas at a U.S. price rather than a world price. What does that mean? That means that natural gas in Europe and in Asia is going to be worth four to five times what natural gas is here. So chemical companies that were thinking about moving overseas 5 years ago in order to be able to buy cheap natural gas for their feedstock, their raw materials, are staying here, expanding here, thinking about moving back. Older people who need to heat and cool their homes can use natural gas at a cheaper price. Manufacturing companies that are adding up the costs to make a decision on whether to put a plant in Mexico or some other place in the United States can put cheap energy in there with the natural gas. For the foreseeable future, it appears that natural gas in Europe and Asia is going to be four or five times what it is in the United States, giving us a tremendous advantage.

So energy research, both in the government and in the private sector, has given the United States the advantage that, if truth be told, has been our advantage ever since World War II. The principal reason we have produced 25 percent of all the money in the world is because of the innovation, technology, and research that have come since World War II, and it is hard to think of an important advance in biological or physical sciences without support from government research. So shale gas is one example of that.

So shale gas is one example of that. Here is another example: I drive an all-electric Nissan LEAF and pay about $3 for the electricity to travel 100 miles—better than spending an equivalent $20 on gasoline. Researchers at battery maker Envia have invented a way to double the density of lithium ion batteries, hastening the arrival of the $20,000 electric cars that travel 300 miles per charge. That research is permitting us, in the case of shale gas, to find more American energy and in the case of electric batteries, to use less of it.

That is why I argue that the United States should launch a series of mini Manhattan Projects with the same focus and determination of the original World War II Manhattan Project, this time with the goal of finding more energy and finding ways to use less of it.

The United States has a resource no other country has—dozens of major research universities and 17 national laboratories that can advance research on cheaper solar, better batteries, recapturing carbon from coal plants, biofuels from crops we don't eat, better ways to dispose of nuclear fuel, offshore winds, green buildings, and even fusion. To pay for doubling the $5 billion the United States now spends on energy research, Congress should end current tax breaks that are exclusively or mostly for both Big Oil and Big Wind and of every $3 saved, use $1 for more research and $2 to reduce the Federal debt.

For all we hear about Big Oil—and we hear a lot about it—you may be surprised to learn that special tax breaks for Big Wind are even greater. During the 5 years between 2009 and 2013, Federal taxpayer subsidies for wind power developers equaled $14 billion, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the U.S. Department of Treasury.

Here, I am only counting the production tax credit and the cash grants that the 2009 stimulus law offered to wind developers in lieu of the tax credit. An analysis of that stimulus cash grant program, which this legislation offered here would extend, found that 64 percent of the 50 highest dollar grants awarded—or about $2.7 billion in subsidies—went to projects that had begun construction before the stimulus measures started. Steve Ellis, vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, told Greenwire:

It's essentially funding economic activity that would have occurred. So it's just a pure subsidy.

It sounds like, in the President's budget, Big Oil receives multiple tax subsidies that are exclusively for Big Oil. Doing away with them, they say, would save about $4.7 billion next year or about $22 billion to $24 billion over 5 years. So far, it sounds as though Big Oil with $22 billion is bigger with its subsidies than Big Wind with only $14 billion. But here is the catch: Many of these subsidies the President is attacking oil companies for receiving are regular tax provisions that are the same or similar to tax provisions that are available to hundreds, even thousands of companies in America. For example, Xerox, Microsoft, and Caterpillar all benefit from tax provisions such as the manufacturing tax credit, amortization or depreciation of used equipment that the President is counting as Big Oil subsidies. And of course wind energy companies also benefit from many of these same provisions, but the production tax credit that benefits mostly wind is in addition to the regular Tax Code provisions that benefit many companies. So the only way to make a fair comparison is to look at subsidies that mostly benefit only oil or mostly benefit only wind, and by that measure, Big Wind gets more tax breaks than Big Oil.

So the bill proposed by the Senator from New Jersey that is limited to just five big oil companies is limited to them even though many of the tax breaks they receive are the same or similar to tax breaks many other companies receive. This bill also extends many tax breaks, including the wind production tax credit and the 1603 grant program for renewable energy, which mostly benefits wind.

Two weeks ago, during the debate on the Transportation bill, the Senate wisely refused to extend the 20-year-old temporary production tax credit which mostly benefits wind. That was the correct decision. We should allow this tax provision to expire. Congress made a much more difficult decision last year to allow the ethanol tax credit to expire, and we should hold our ground and do the same thing for the wind production tax credit.

There are three reasons Big Wind subsidies should go the way of the $5 billion annual ethanol subsidy. First, we can't afford it. The Federal Government borrows 40 cents of every dollar we spend.

It can't justify such a subsidy, especially for what the U.S. Energy Secretary calls a mature technology. According to a 2008 Energy Information Agency report, Big Wind received in subsidies 25 times as much per megawatt hour as all other forms of electricity production combined.

Second, wind turbines produce a relatively puny amount of unreliable, expensive energy. Wind produces about 2.3 percent of all of our electricity. A better alternative is clean natural gas. An even better alternative is cleaner nuclear power. Nuclear power reactors power our Navy and produce 70 percent of our pollution-free electricity. Using windmills to power a country that uses one-fourth of the world's electricity would be the energy equivalent of going to war in sailboats.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has erected 18 massive wind turbines on 3,300-foot Buffalo Mountain outside Knoxville. Other than deface the landscape and waste ratepayer dollars, the turbines have done little. The wind there blows 19 percent of the time, usually at night when we don't need it, and its unused electricity production cannot be stored.

Finally, there is the question of whether, in the name of saving the environment, wind turbines are destroying the environment. These are not your grandma's windmills. They are taller than the Statue of Liberty. Their blades are as long as a football field, and their blinking lights can be seen for 20 miles. In Nashville, Vanderbilt and the Metro water system is about to erect a small wind turbine as tall as the Parthenon replica we have in Nashville. It would take 1.1 million of these eyesores to equal the production of TVA's new Watts Bar 2 nuclear reactor. Building that many turbines would cost 15 times the cost of the nuclear reactor, and you would still need the nuclear plant for when the wind doesn't blow.

When wind advocate T. Boone Pickens was asked whether he would put turbines on his Texas ranch, he answered, ''No. They're ugly.''

Birds must think of turbines as Cuisinarts in the sky. Eagle killing has become so commonplace that the U.S. Department of the Interior has set up a process to grant licenses for eagle takings, sort of a hunting license. A new documentary, ''Windfall,'' chronicles the despair of upstate New York residents debating whether to build giant turbines in their town.

So I ask the question: If wind has all these drawbacks, is a mature technology, and receives subsidies greater than any other form of energy per unit of actual energy produced, why are we subsidizing it with billions of dollars and why are we not including it in this debate? Why are we talking about Big Oil subsidies and not Big Wind subsidies?

Our energy policies should be, first, to double the $5 billion Federal energy research budget we now have and focus it on new forms of cheap, clean, reliable energy. I am talking about the 500-mile battery for electric cars; commercial uses of carbon captured from coal plants; solar power installed at less than $1 per watt; or offshore wind turbines. That would be research.

Second, we should strictly limit a handful of jumpstart research and development projects to take new technologies from the R&D phase to the commercial phase. I am thinking here of projects such as ARPA–E, modeled after the defense department's DARPA agency that led to the Internet, to the stealth, and to other remarkable technologies; or the 5-year program for small modular nuclear reactors; or incentives for the first 200,000 electric vehicles purchased in America. These are a strictly limited number of jumpstart R&D projects.

Third, we should end wasteful, long-term, special tax breaks, such as those for Big Oil and those for Big Wind. I am talking about the tax breaks that are exclusively mostly for Big Oil and Big Wind and not similar to what other industries receive. These savings from those subsidies should be used to double clean energy research and to reduce our Federal debt.

But that is not what this bill does. This bill ends subsidies for five companies that many other companies receive, and it extends subsidies for a few companies that other industries don't get.

This debate isn't even about an energy plan, which is what we should be debating when gas is around $4 a gallon right now.

Here is a very specific plan: Increase energy research—double it—to find more American oil and more American natural gas and more American alternative forms of energy, and increase energy research to find ways to use less of that energy. I have highlighted the best ways to use less, and I have highlighted a way to pay for it.

I thank the President and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a couple weeks ago, and just now my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, has been speaking on the Senate floor in opposition to the wind energy production tax credit.

Obviously, I have great respect for Senator ALEXANDER. A person who has been in the Cabinet, a person who has been Governor of their State, a person who has been president of a university, and probably a lot of other important positions, can't help but be respected as a very important Senator and a very knowledgeable Senator. While I differ with him greatly on this issue, I will continue to respect him.

The greatness of this body allows for debate and disagreeing points of view to be heard. I disagree strongly with my colleague. It might be natural for me to do that because I have championed the wind energy tax credit as a way to provide a level playing field for a very clean renewable resource.

As a result, wind energy has become more efficient and cost effective. The cost of wind energy has declined by 90 percent since the 1980s. Wind has accounted for 35 percent of all new American electric generation in the last 5 years. Wind already provides 20 percent of the electric generation in my State of Iowa. It supports as many as 5,000 good-paying jobs in our State.

As a result of the tax incentive, the wind energy has actually created new manufacturing jobs in the United States. Today, 60 percent of the wind turbines' value is now produced in the United States, compared with 25 percent 6 years ago. There are now 400 facilities building wind components in 43 States. That is why a bill in the House of Representatives to extend the wind energy production tax credit has 80 cosponsors, including 18 Republicans.

If we fail to extend the incentive, thousands of jobs will be lost in the wind manufacturing industry. Unemployment remains high at 8.3 percent. Why would Congress exacerbate the unemployment in our country by failing to extend this successful incentive?

The Senator from Tennessee has criticized wind turbines because he believes they are ugly and they kill birds. Well, I happen to find them majestic and awe-inspiring on the landscape.

With regard to bill-kill accusations, the Senator's claims were evaluated by Politifact, a fact-checking organization. They concluded that the estimates of birds killed by wind turbines vary widely and that there is no consensus. They do point out that the 400,000-bird estimate used by Senator ALEXANDER is the conclusion of just one person. It is not an official U.S. Fish and Wildlife estimate. In fact, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife cites figures that are, at most, half that, if not less by much.

By comparison, 976 million birds die annually from collisions with buildings. Collisions with high-tension lines kill between 130 million and 1 billion birds. Cars kill 80 million birds each year.

The Senator from Tennessee referred many times to the wind project built in his State by the Tennessee Valley Authority. They constructed a 29-megawatt wind farm at Buffalo Mountain at a cost of $60 million. But it only generates 6 megawatts, because it generates electricity only 19 percent of the time. The Senator criticized it as being inefficient, wasteful, and ill-advised. The TVA apparently characterizes it as a failed experiment. He blames the Federal incentive for this failed wind project. The blame is totally misplaced. I think the blame should go to the taxpayer-subsidized TVA which put windmills where there was very little wind.

We do agree that the modification made to the renewable energy incentives in the stimulus bill of 2009, specifically the creation of the 1603 cash grant program, is in fact bad policy and should not be extended. However, the production tax credit, which I first authored in 1992, provides the incentive only for electricity that is actually produced. Under the production tax credit, there is no tax benefit simply for placing the turbine in the ground. Electricity must be produced in order to get the credit.

The Senator from Tennessee went on to say that the tax incentive has encouraged developers to build wind projects in places with insufficient wind resources. The TVA project is the only one I am aware of that was built with no prospects of generating electricity. For-profit utilities have to look out for the bottom line. They are not going to make an investment if it doesn't make economic sense. A nonprofit such as TVA can fritter away money, which is what they apparently did in this wind energy project.

The Senator from Tennessee might spend a bit of time criticizing the leaders of the TVA over their poor decision to build this wind project in the first place. I am not aware of a policy forcing them to develop wind. There is no mandate that they build a wind farm there in the State of Tennessee.

Most intelligent businesses determine whether an investment makes common sense. The Tennessee Valley Authority obviously failed in that regard in relationship to this wind project. The Senator from Tennessee might use his time getting to the bottom of this leadership failure and squandered resources by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I am also glad that he raised the issue of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Much of the criticism aimed at the wind production tax credit is that it is costly, was meant to be temporary, and that it provides a small benefit at great cost. Those same accusations could clearly be aimed at the Tennessee Valley Authority. Regardless of one's opinion of the TVA, there is no doubt—it is a big government program subsidized by all Americans that benefits just a few.

The TVA was created in 1933 to provide flood control, navigation services, and electrical power in the Tennessee Valley region. For more than 60 years, Congress appropriated funds to cover losses by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

A 2009 article published by Jim Powell of the Cato Institute noted that a study estimated the annual cost of capital subsidies exceeded $1.2 billion, including taxes that the Tennessee Valley Authority was able to avoid.

In 1997, the Heritage Foundation issued a report entitled "Five Good Reasons to Force the TVA into Mandatory Retirement." This report stated:

> Throughout its history, the TVA has benefited from generous subsidies, tax breaks, and regulatory exemptions that allow it to keep its power rates lower than the national averages. Yet, despite its protected geographic monopoly, substantial indirect subsidies totalling roughly $1.2 billion each year, sweeping, across-the-board regulatory exemptions, the TVA has managed to amass a debt of well over $27 billion and a disturbing record of waste, mismanagement, and chronic cost overruns.

The private nonprofit group Citizens Against Government Waste has suggested selling the TVA's electric power assets and privatizing its nonpower functions. In their 2011 list of "Prime Cuts," they argued this move would save taxpayers $16.2 billion over 5 years.

Even the Congressional Budget Office listed the TVA in its March 2011 report on spending and revenue options to reduce the national debt and the annual deficit. When the Federal Government is borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend, perhaps the time has come to review an entity that benefits 3 percent of the population at a cost of over $1.2 billion annually. And I use that 40 cents the Federal Government is borrowing of every dollar we spend just as the Senator from Tennessee a few minutes ago used that very same figure as a rationale for eliminating certain expenditures. In this particular case, I apply it to the Congressional Budget Office recommendation of selling TVA.

Rather than blaming the tax incentives for an ill-conceived wind project, I think a review of the management and taxpayer subsidy of TVA would be more appropriate. On many occasions, the Senator from Tennessee has argued that the incentives should be repealed and the savings used to double the Federal energy research budget and to support development of new nuclear.

First, I support research efforts to develop clean energy, but I do not support imposing a tax hike on one energy industry so we can spend billions through our Federal bureaucracy. This idea is nothing more than a tax increase to pay for further Washington spending. It is this kind of activity that helped create the fiscal mess our country is in right now.

Second, I strongly support nuclear energy. In fact, I believe there are four critical elements to a comprehensive energy policy. They are drilling for domestic oil and gas, promoting renewable and alternative energy, supporting conservation and, of course, fourth, nuclear energy.

Nuclear is an emission-free resource. It certainly should play a key role in providing our Nation and economy with renewable emission-free energy. However, this discussion of wind energy versus nuclear energy should be an intellectually honest debate. The fact is, nuclear energy in the United States would not exist today—would not even be here today—without significant government support over 60 years, and development of new nuclear in the United States is unlikely to happen without even greater government intervention and subsidies.

An analysis done by the Christian Science Monitor concluded that the nuclear power industry in the United States receives about $9 billion annually in subsidies. They state that the subsidies stem from things such as Federal decommissioning, waste management policy, and research and development in the Nation's National Laboratories.

The Union of Concerned Scientists published a document in February of last year entitled "Nuclear Power: Still Not Viable without Subsidies." They contend that the 50-year-old nuclear industry has benefited from 30 subsidies. The Price-Anderson insurance liability policy was enacted in 1957 as a temporary measure for an infant industry. It was recently extended until the year 2025.

The Cato Institute published an article, June 2003, entitled "No Corporate Welfare for Nuclear Power."

That report states:

> Despite extensive and continued government assistance—including more than $66 billion in research and development alone—no nuclear powerplant has been ordered and built in the United States since 1973.

But it goes further.

> The decline of nuclear power is the result of several factors: the Three Mile Island disaster heightened public safety fears and citizen opposition to the siting of grants in their neighborhood grew. But nuclear power was ultimately rejected by investors because it simply does not make economic sense. In truth, nuclear power has never made economic sense and exists purely as a creature of government.

A more recent piece by the Cato Institute cites an economist who believes existing nuclear power subsidies are equal to one-third or more of the value of the power produced, and that they face a negative 49-percent tax rate.

There are only two new nuclear plants on the drawing board in the United States today. Both are recipients of loan guaranties provided by the Department of Energy. One is an $8.3 billion loan guaranty, and the other is $2 billion. When the Loan Guaranty Program was first created by Congress, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that "the risk of default on such loan guaranties to be very high—well above 50 percent." This is the same program that backed Solyndra.

Congress originally set aside $18.5 billion for loan guaranties for nuclear. President Obama has requested tripling that amount to $54.5 billion. It is estimated that this $54 billion would help construct 12 new nuclear plants. That is about $4.5 billion each.

Congress created a production tax credit for new nuclear in the year 2005.

Now the nuclear industry is advocating a 30-percent investment tax credit for these new nuclear constructions.

They are also advocating that the production tax credit be extended to the year 2025—that is right; they are seeking to extend for another 13 years a temporary tax incentive.

Taxpayers for Common Sense, in an article published just last week, concluded:

> The U.S. cannot afford to shoulder the high price tag and long term fiscal risk. If the industry cannot figure out a way to manage its long term risks, the taxpayer should not step in. This is especially true when the nation is staring into a $15 trillion chasm of debt. After more than 50 years of subsidies and support, it's well past time for the nuclear industry to stand on its own two feet.

I do not raise these points to undermine our nuclear industry. I am not urging my colleagues to end the entire big nuclear gravy train at this time. I support that form of energy as one component of a comprehensive energy program. I support a real, ''all-of-the-above'' approach to energy security. But a fair comparison of Federal support for wind and nuclear needs to be made. That is the point of my remarks at this time.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee, as he just spoke and as he spoke a couple of weeks ago, it is intellectually dishonest to criticize wind incentives while at the same time ignoring those subsidies for nuclear energy. The Senator from Tennessee referred to a Wall Street Journal editorial that criticized the wind energy incentive. It called into question whether wind energy could survive a market-based system.

I will eagerly await an editorial in the Wall Street Journal—which, by the way, will never appear—calling for the gravy train for big nuclear to end after nearly 60 years of Federal subsidies with no market-based timetable on the horizon.

I yield the floor. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session at 4:30 p.m. today and that all other provisions of the previous consent remain in effect, and that the previous order regarding the division of time on the motion to proceed to S. 2230 be modified to reflect this consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. For the information of Senators, the two votes originally scheduled to begin at 6 p.m. will now begin at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, right outside this Chamber, across the street, is a huge gathering. It is the third day in succession that people from all across America have gathered before the Supreme Court. They have different points of view. They express those points of view in various ways—with signs, chants, music, a variety of others—costumes that are worn to express their points of view.

Let me first salute the fact that it is part of America. It is protected, and no one is going to be arrested for expressing themselves, whether they are for or against health care reform. We take it for granted, and we should not because in some countries around the world it is an exception rather than a rule. In America, it is who we are. We should celebrate even when we disagree.

But let me say a word about what is going on inside the building across the street. They are considering the health care reform bill that was passed by the Congress and signed by President Obama. Some have tried to characterize it as ObamaCare. For the longest time that was the biggest applause line at Republican Presidential rallies, after candidate after candidate stood up and said: I will repeal ObamaCare.

Let me speak to the issue which I think is guiding the discussion across the street and give perhaps a perspective on it that is not often stated on this floor. Earlier this morning several of my colleagues on the Republican side who voted against health care reform came to the Senate floor to express their opposition to the notion of a mandate. Here is what the mandate is about.

Currently, in America, there are millions of people who have no health insurance. Some of them by choice—young people think they are invincible; they will not buy it. Some people cannot afford it. But the fact is, even these uninsured people get sick.

When they get sick or are the victims of trauma—automobile accidents, diagnosed with a disease—they don't stay at home and wait for death, they go to a hospital. When they arrive at that hospital they are treated—emergency rooms, regular treatment—and then the bills are sent their way. Without health insurance many of them cannot pay the bills.

A little over a year and a half ago I went in for one night, overnight surgery in Chicago—the first time I was ever in a hospital since I was born. Everything worked perfectly. The ending was great. I couldn't ask for a better result. The total bill, start to finish, was $100,000.

Lucky for me, I am a Senator. I have the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. It paid for almost everything. What if I had no insurance? They would have sent me the bill. Perhaps I could have come up with the money to pay for it, but some people cannot. What happens then?

The hospitals and doctors then take these bills and say: Well, so-and-so didn't pay their bill. We are going to charge someone else who is paying more. Mr. President, 63 percent of the medical care given to uninsured people in America is not paid for, 63 percent. It is shifted, that financial responsibility is shifted to those who do pay, those who are under government insurance programs and private insurance programs. What it means is for those of us in private insurance programs, we pay $1,000 more a year—$80-plus a month—to pay off the bills of those who are uninsured. That is the subsidy which insured people pay to cover the unpaid medical expenses of the uninsured. That is the starting point.

Until we reach the point where everyone is under the tent of insurance, this will continue. Uninsured people will get sick, and those who buy insurance will pay for them. That is cost shifting. It happens every single day in America.

The health care reform bill said we have to have health insurance. It is a mandate. But we know some people cannot afford it. If someone is poor, in the lower income category, we will enroll them in Medicaid so they will have at least Medicaid insurance to pay their medical bills.

At Memorial Medical Center in my hometown of Springfield, IL, Ed Curtis, who runs that hospital, said to me: Senator, if you just did that alone, if we could just get Medicaid payment for everyone who walked through the door, we would be fine. What hurts us are those who pay nothing because they can't. That is a problem. The bill we passed went on to say that if you are working, you will never have to pay more than 8 percent of your income for health insurance premiums. People would rather pay nothing, but 8 percent is a lot more manageable than people who are facing 10, 20, 30 percent of their pay going to health insurance premiums. So we basically have created a requirement to have health insurance but with a helping hand to reach that goal.

So what about the people who already have health insurance? They are untouched by this mandate. They just continue on and let life continue. You have made your choice; you have health insurance; it doesn't affect you.

What I find interesting are so many Senators—primarily from the other side of the aisle—who come to this floor condemning government-administered health insurance. ''Get the government out of health insurance.'' You hear that speech over and over. What they don't tell you is their own health insurance policies are administered by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, as Members of the Senate, you and I are eligible—so too are Members of the House—to be part of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. This was created decades ago to provide health insurance for people working for the Federal Government. Eight million people—employees and their families—are covered by this plan. What you have learned as a new Senator is that they come to us once a year and say: DURBIN, you and your wife are eligible for the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and here are the private insurance plans you can choose from that are enrolled in our program.

We have nine choices in Illinois, so Loretta and I looked through and picked the plan we liked. We pay part of my income as premium, and the government pays the remainder. It is a government-administered plan, and each year we have an open enrollment to change if we wish. This has been wildly successful and popular. Private insurance companies fight to enroll in it so they can cover Federal employees, and we have good, reliable, affordable insurance, insurance that we can change if we don't like it.

A few years back, one of my employees needed a specific foot surgery. It turned out her health insurance didn't cover it, but she knew the open enrollment period was coming. She waited and enrolled in a plan that covered it. What a luxury. People across America would applaud if they thought they could get that treatment, government-administered health care for Members of Congress.

I have waited patiently now throughout this entire debate for the first Republican Senator who condemns government-administered health care to come to the well of the Senate and announce they are dropping their own health insurance as a matter of principle. No way.

I think people across America are entitled to health insurance that is at least as good as the health insurance Members of Congress have today. I don't think that is a radical idea, and, in fact, the health care reform bill we passed said that Members of Congress will be part of the same insurance exchanges we are creating all across America. That is only fair. I am hoping it offers the same plans as the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, but I am sure it will offer me a choice, and with that choice I am sure my family will get good coverage.

When I hear the debates across the street suggesting that the notion of requiring people to buy health insurance is somehow un-American or unconstitutional, I struggle with that concept. We know what we are trying to do—reduce the overall cost of health care for America. We also know that the requirement of having health insurance is not that much different from the requirement of paying into Social Security if you go to work in America. If you want another parallel, in my State you have to have insurance to drive an automobile. They don't want you getting involved in an accident without insurance. For one thing, it is not fair to the other driver, let alone the person who might be injured in the car. These are mandates under the law relative to insurance—one for retirement, the other for liability—that are built into the law, and we don't have people marching in the streets over them.

We have to come to a point in this country where we reach a balance, and the balance suggests personal responsibility. It means that the millions of Americans who should have and could have health insurance with the help of a tax break, perhaps with the help of Medicaid, should have that insurance so that the burden of their medical bills does not fall on every other family and every other insured person. Those who are screaming for freedom ought to stop and think a second. Those who are accepting the personal responsibility of having health insurance are exercising their right to protect their family, and they should have the peace of mind of knowing that their neighbor who didn't accept his personal responsibility will not pass his medical bills on to them. I think that is the basis of what we are debating across the street.

I would like to raise a point, if I can, about a bill that was pending this week. It was offered by Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey to end Federal subsidies to oil companies.

Last Sunday in Chicago, I went by a BP gas station on the Congress Expressway, and I saw it for the first time—more than $5 a gallon for gas, $5.03 a gallon for ultimate gasoline at the BP station. For reasons I cannot explain, Illinois has the highest gasoline prices in America. We have refineries all over our State. I don't get it. But I know it is a recurring problem and a recurring theme. Every spring we go through it. The runup to Easter is the time for every politician in America to dust off the press release expressing outrage at our oil companies.

They do it to us every year. They come up with convenient excuses: You know, it is all about uncertainty in the Middle East. How long have they been playing that card. No, it is about the change of seasons. You see, when we go from winter to spring, we just are not ready for it. Really? You weren't ready for the change of seasons? There was a refinery accident in some town in the Midwest 400 miles away, and it has really disrupted everything. Well, I don't buy it, and I haven't over the years.

What they are doing is what they can do: they run up the price of this commodity because we have no choice. Until we have a choice in the vehicles we drive or in the sources of energy we use, we are kind of stuck with oil companies. But we are not stuck with paying a $4 billion annual subsidy to these oil companies. That is what the tax break we give to oil companies comes to. Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey has said: Stop it. Take the $4 billion and invest it in renewable, sustainable energy research, and take the rest and reduce the deficit. The five biggest oil companies had profits of over $137 billion last year. They won't miss $4 billion. And we should be ashamed that we continue to shove subsidies at them when they are so profitable.

What is happening when it comes to oil exploration? It is a legitimate question. We are now at an 8-year high in terms of the oil production in America. Starting under President Bush and continuing under President Obama, we have more oil and gas rigs in place working today in the United States than in the rest of the world combined. So those who say that if we just drilled a little more, gasoline prices would come down, you have to look at that. We are increasing the supply, and yet the prices go up.

Secondly, we also understand that when it comes to these gasoline prices, even when the supply goes up, the prices are going up. It defies the law of physics. Demand is down because of the recession, supply is up, and prices are going up. That violates principles of economics 101 that I studied in college.

What Senator MENENDEZ is suggesting is a move in the right direction, not just because we cannot justify the subsidies to oil companies anymore but because we should be investing in new ideas that will move us forward in the right direction.

This morning we had a meeting that I think the Presiding Officer attended, and the CEO of Chrysler Corporation was there. He is an interesting and curious man, Sergio Marchionne. I don't think he owns a suit and tie. He never wears one. He is the CEO of a major corporation, and he wears kind of a black-knit sweater. I see him all the time. But you have to give him credit; he took Chrysler Corporation when it was on the ropes struggling and near extinction and turned it around completely. They are looking forward to more than doubling the automobiles they are going to sell. Those who thought that the automobile bailout, as they called it, was a bad idea should listen to this man.

I can tell him the story of Belvidere, IL, northern Illinois, Boone county. We have a Chrysler production facility that Marchionne said to me is one of our best. They have gone on to a second shift, and he said that by the end of the year, they will go to a third shift in producing cars for America. He gets it. And when you talk to him about fuel efficiency and fuel economy in cars, they are moving in that direction. They are committed to it.

The President brokered an agreement with the major auto companies that they would make more fuel-efficient vehicles. That is good news for consumers. We need to be subsidizing research into better, more efficient forms of energy instead of subsidizing oil companies with recordbreaking profits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the assistant majority leader. I heard his comments about Chrysler and what happened with the CEO when he was in town today talking to some of our colleagues. And one of the untold stories of the auto rescue is not just that in my State 800,000 people work directly or indirectly for the auto industry. Most of those are part of the supply chain that makes products and sells those products—a large number of them—that are assembled in Lordstown or Toledo or different places around Ohio. But one of the untold stories is that not only were these jobs and these companies saved from going bankrupt—and who knows what would have happened to a State such as mine where much of the State is pretty dependent on the auto industry—but in the case of the Toledo Jeep plant, prior to the auto rescue only 50 percent of the components that went into the Jeep Wrangler were made in the United States. After the President and Vice President negotiated with the auto industry and the auto task force and the House and Senate weighed in, now 75 percent of the components that go into the Jeep Wrangler are made in the United States. So we are not just seeing the 5,000 jobs in Lordstown making the Chevy Cruze or the jobs at the Honda assembly plants in Marysville, OH, or Toledo, or Ford, we are also seeing that a lot more of the components are made in the United States. And these are often union jobs, often not union jobs, but they are almost all good-paying jobs that give people a ticket to the middle-class. It helps them to buy a house, send their son or daughter to school, or buy a car. Without it, my State would probably be in a depression.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator from Ohio, that is a good point and one we ought to make over and over because there is no question that the downturn in the recession forced the management of these auto companies and the workers to step back and take a look at the challenges they faced.

Mr. Marchionne, the CEO of Chrysler, said this morning: We are where we are today because our UAW workers—union workers—sat down at the table and said, we have to agree on a future together or we are sunk. They agreed on that future, and he said: Now my workforce is excited and productive.

The Senator just made the point—more businesses are coming back from overseas. It is a great success story.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have been to the plant where they make the engine for the Chevy Cruze, I have been to the plant where they make the bumper for some of these cars, and I have been to the assembly plants, and the workers are excited. And the workers sacrificed a lot, as the auto industry—all kinds of people took a hit with the managed bankruptcy of those two companies. But we have seen not just the auto industry, but for 12 years, from 1997 to 2009, in my State and I assume in Illinois too and all over the country we lost manufacturing jobs. Almost every month for the last 2 years we have gained manufacturing jobs.

The auto rescue is not the only reason we have seen things turn around. We also have a productive workforce and we are training workers better. I have 55 college presidents I just met with whom I bring to Washington for a conference—it is the fifth year in a row. Senator PORTMAN, Congresswoman SUTTON, and others have met with them. They are more focused than ever on manufacturing, working to train those people so they can go into manufacturing. The students they are educating are in a whole lot of fields, but one of them is focusing on how to train people to do this high-end, much more technical, complicated manufacturing than a generation ago, and it is starting to work.

Mr. DURBIN. It is not lost on the American people. There was a different point of view when President Obama said: I never wanted to own an automobile company; that is not why I ran for President. But he realized we faced an economic crisis. If he had not stepped in for Chrysler and General Motors at the moment he did, they might not exist today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, if my colleague would yield one more time, it wouldn't have just been Chrysler and General Motors that would have faltered. Honda—a foreign-owned company that has made a huge and positive presence in the Columbus area, in northwest Columbus and in Marysville—and Ford, obviously one of the Big Three but one that didn't ask for the rescue—both those companies wanted us to do the rescue because they knew if we didn't, their whole supply chain would begin to fall apart too. So this mattered not just for Chrysler and GM, saving them, and now that they are putting tens of thousands of people all over the country back to work, it mattered for the entire industry, including the foreign companies that have invested and hired a lot of American workers.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would just add—and this is not lost on most Americans—there are some political figures who said publicly they should have just gone bankrupt and gone out of business. I think the President made the right decision. Today, Mr. Marchionne made it clear Chrysler has paid back everything. They have paid it all back. So now, he said, if we need to borrow money, we are not going to come knock on the door of Secretary Geithner of the Treasury Department; we can go to banks. We are a thriving corporation. We are doing well. He said: I have nothing but good news for you, which is great to hear in a recovering economy.

It was a bet made by the President on behalf of hundreds of thousands of workers and companies and it paid off. What it says is that if we stand behind the basic pillars of the American economy—and manufacturing is one of those; maybe the largest pillar that holds up this great economy—we can prosper and succeed. Jobs being brought back from Mexico and overseas into the United States, I am glad I have lived to see it because I can remember when they were headed in the other direction.

Companies that were almost given up on by some politicians turned out, such as GM and Chrysler, to be prosperous today, building new cars and thinking about the new demands of our economy and our future, tells me we can put this together.

So when we hear those who say what we need to continue to do is to shovel subsidies at oil companies that earn $137 billion a year in profits, let's take that money—we do have a deficit—take that money, invest it in something that will create jobs and take the balance and reduce the deficit. I don't think that is a bad outcome. There are lots of good things we can invest in. The Department of Energy is talking about battery technology. That is still going to be our challenge for the future—finding ways to create power and save power for when it is needed. I think we need to incentivize that kind of research in the future as well.

At this point, I will yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, right now there is an issue on the mind of every Hoosier and most Americans, if not every American, and that issue is the high price of gas. Over the past few months, gas prices have risen higher and higher each week. Currently, across the Nation, the average price is $3.90. In Indiana, it is even higher. It is close to $4, and in many parts of our State it is well over $4 per gallon.

These prices obviously have a significant economic impact on our country. It causes budgets to get tighter, planned vacations to either be canceled or shortened; families, farmers, and businesses across the State of Indiana are having to rethink their budgets for the year and make tough financial decisions. This is all at a time when unemployment continues to remain high. Americans are struggling to make ends meet. Rising gas and energy costs only further weaken an already struggling economy.

It is true supply and demand of gasoline and oil prices are subject to global considerations. There are concerns that the supply is not meeting the demand. That triggers some clear increase in prices of crude oil. There is also the concern that conflict in the Middle East could potentially shut down lanes of commerce that bring oil out of the Middle East to the rest of the world. So we need to acknowledge there are these spikes.

However, this is a trend that has been going up and up and up. We have seen gas prices more than double in the last 3 years and, clearly, now $3.50, $3.75 is not something that looks like a spike; it is starting to look like the normal average and that certainly has real serious economic implications for this country.

There is some good news. The good news is, Americans are increasingly understanding and learning we can be a major player in producing energy. We are discovering abundant amounts of energy in this country we didn't think we had. A lot of that is right in our backyard. That is the good news. The bad news is, we have had an administration that for 3 years has been promoting policies that work against the goal of achieving more energy independence. That is the problem with the bill we are currently discussing because that bill raises gasoline prices by raising taxes on oil production. Why in the world would we want to raise prices on gasoline at a time when America's economy is struggling to come out of recession? At a time when gasoline prices are rising through the supply-and-demand issues we have had, why in the world would we want to do anything that would further increase the cost of gas at the pump?

The current Tax Code provides a number of targeted tax incentives for the energy sector. It is important to note the vast majority of those subsidies go to the so-called new wave of energy production, the renewables, and only a small minority of those subsidies and credits go to producing the oil and gas that drives this economy. So eliminating only those benefits that go to the production of needed oil and gas that benefits our economy while at the same time extending the subsidies and credits and support for renewables is not the direction we need to go. This is not about producing more energy; it is about targeting just one sector of our energy industry, which is oil—a fossil fuel energy source that is absolutely essential to our economy. If we want to eliminate oil and gas subsidies, we ought to put all subsidies for energy on the table.

Senator WYDEN and I have coauthored a comprehensive tax reform bill, and in that bill we look at the idea proposed and suggested not only by the Bowles-Simpson Commission but by others who have looked at this and who have said we need to get on a level playing field. We are willing to make adjustments even in our own bill, if it is necessary, so we can lower tax rates on American companies and on the American people by getting to a more level playing field.

We have all heard the President say we are doing all of the above or we need to do all of the above in terms of an energy approach, and unblock American resources and put us back in the driver's seat of energy production. The reality is, the administration's policies over the last 3 years have been directed at only subsidizing a certain portion of the ''all of the above.''

Let me give a couple examples. President Obama has reduced the number of new offshore leases in half over the next 5 years. In terms of current exploration and production, 97 percent of offshore areas are out of bounds, cannot drill, cannot explore.

Most recently, the President rejected the Keystone XL Pipeline, a privately—privately, not publicly—funded project that would create 20,000 jobs and deliver more than 800,000 barrels of oil per day from Canada.

Then, just last week, the President says we are going to improve the pipeline from Cushing, Oklahoma down to Port Arthur, Texas but rejected doing anything to bring the pipeline from the source of the oil down to the point in Oklahoma where it would continue on. That is essentially akin to saying: We have goods we need to move. They are essential. They are essential to the running of this country and the economy and we need to ship those from Chicago to New Orleans, but we are only going to build the road from Little Rock to New Orleans, and we will not have any other way of transporting it to get it to that particular point. So it makes no sense whatsoever.

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot tell the American people we support an ''all of the above'' energy plan and then undercut attempts to produce domestic energy sources. We cannot say we want to reduce America's dependence on foreign oil and then block major parts of the Keystone Pipeline or tell political leaders in Brazil we want the United States to be one of their best customers. We cannot tell Americans we are focused on job creation and then impose one unrealistic regulation after another that increase energy costs, jeopardize jobs, and shut down plants across the country. But that is exactly what this administration is doing.

The Obama energy plan is to pay lip service to American energy production at the same time while enacting policies that limit our ability to tap into domestic resources.

Our country faces an energy crisis. We have high unemployment. We have troops putting themselves on the frontline to protect oil in the Middle East. But we can change that. We can unlock American energy resources. We can put Americans back to work in doing so. We can protect our troops and reduce our dependence on Middle East oil. We have the ability, we have the innovation, and we have now, we know, the resources to lead the world in energy production. It is time for the President to support American energy production. That is the real ''all of the above'' energy plan.

I yield the floor and 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. ROBERTS. 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. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss what everybody else is discussing these days—I say discussing or maybe even cussing—and that is gas prices and, more to the point, some unfortunate finger-pointing that I think is going on in regards to our energy policies and why we see the increase we are seeing at the gas pump and the role of speculation in regards to the futures market and the energy environment we are now living in that is so challenging.

I have the privilege of being the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and I feel it is very important to address some of the claims being made by a number of my friends—some across the aisle—this week with regard to speculation in the commodities market.

From the rural farmer to the urban commuter, Americans everywhere are, obviously, deeply impacted by high gas prices. That is the biggest and most often negative sign we see when we drive anywhere: Whoops, we see all of a sudden that the gas price has shot up 10 cents. Unfortunately, I do not think posturing or finger-pointing does anything to minimize the pain felt at the pumps.

Similar to the annual planting and harvesting seasons in Kansas, a yearly occurrence happens in Washington, DC, for certain Members of Congress to blame the commodity markets every time a particular commodity reaches an uncomfortable price level. If we see a big price jump, we, obviously, want to blame the commodity markets. It is easy to do. We saw it in the 1970s when we had gas lines during the Carter administration, the 1980s, the 1990s. It is the same old talking points. We could have the speech in the file. Just pull out the file, cross out the date, and start making these points.

But let me talk about some economic facts, if I might. The populist rhetoric fails to acknowledge that everyone's money is the same color in the futures market. For every buyer, there is a seller and for every seller there is a buyer.

The historical problem for futures markets and the hedgers who use them is, oftentimes, particularly in the deferred month contracts, there is not the liquidity or an adequate number of market participants to take the other side of a trade to allow the hedgers to manage their deferred price risk.

Market participants who actually provide this liquidity provide a valuable tool that allows producers and consumers of products to lock in their inventories well in advance, which can lead to lower costs to producers and certainly better prices for consumers.

If long speculation and the liquidity it provides is artificially driven from the market, the potential short-term advantage of lower prices could lead to shortages in production, higher demand, and even higher prices for both energy and agricultural commodities.

My point in this dissertation on futures markets 101 is to emphasize that speculation is not manipulation. Speculation is trading to make a profit from anticipated price changes—either higher or lower. Manipulation, on the other hand, is intentionally acting to cause artificial price changes.

As explained by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the independent regulatory arbiter of excessive speculation, speculation is excessive when it causes any sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of a commodity.

In fact, the CFTC currently has the authority to regulate against price manipulation. So if we want to go to the people who are in charge to make sure there is not any manipulation, we already have the regulatory body and they are doing exactly that and it has had this authority since its creation by Congress in 1974.

Furthermore, we have experts at the clearinghouses, at the National Futures Association, and at the CFTC whose job it is to watch these markets minute by minute, hour by hour, day by day, to assure everybody that the discovery of prices between buyers and sellers is occurring openly and transparently.

Yet when prices just so happen to move above what somebody in this body might think is reasonable or an uncomfortable level, we have a tendency to blame the participants in the market rather than the multitude of factors and economic variables these market participants react to each minute the market is trading.

Let's examine some of these real factors that are affecting our energy prices.

First off, there is tremendous increased demand outside the United States; particularly, in Asia, China. It has caused the price of oil to rise rather dramatically. Even with the increased production in Canada, the United States, and Brazil, declines in the North Sea, Mexico, Sudan, and Libya have impacted the global supply.

Second, our U.S. refining capacity has decreased as a result of stricter environmental regulations, where they get their crude from. Both have lowered the supply of gasoline enough to prop up prices. We see reports in the press every day about one refinery making it big and other refineries are having a lot of difficulty.

Third, restricted domestic energy development on Federal lands has disrupted our futures projections.

Fourth, fear over Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions is leading to increased demand for gasoline, as people try to stock up in anticipation of any supply disruption that would be based on the possibility of a conflict in the Middle East.

Lastly, I would simply point out that blaming speculators ignores the inflationary aspects of the monetary policies of several central banks around the globe. It does not take a speculator to know that when the U.S. Treasury prints more money, it drives down the value of the dollar and drives up the price of raw materials and commodities, such as oil, priced in dollars. Yet despite these facts, we have too many who keep seeking a solution for a problem that simply isn't there.

What have the regulatory bodies found in their investigations as we look for somebody to blame? There have already been studies and investigations into whether excessive speculation is manipulation and they are manipulating prices. Let's take a look at what they found.

Last year, a Federal Trade Commission report on manipulation of gas prices determined that none of the complaints investigated violated any FTC rules.

A similar study by the CFTC stated that its preliminary analysis ''does not support the proposition that speculative activity has systematically driven changes in oil prices.''

Last but not least, the administration's own Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force set out to investigate illegal speculation in the energy markets. To date, it has found none.

The effects of high gas prices on our economic growth and on each individual business and family are certainly well understood. We should be finding effective solutions to fix a failed Federal energy policy rather than trying to place the blame where it does not exist.

These solutions do not stop at increased domestic oil and gas production. They include implementation of workable environmental regulations. Unfortunately, the multitude of regulations under this administration is anything but workable.

They are like a Katrina flooding virtually every part of the economic sector. That is all I hear about when I go home to Kansas. There are a lot of things that are on people's minds, but regulation is No. 1, and I don't care what sector of the economy we are talking about. There is a very real fear in my State that the new clean air regulations we are hearing about targeting coal-fired powerplants could disrupt our power grid. In a State that relies on coal for 75 percent of our power, this is simply unacceptable.

Yes, let's continue moving toward cleaner forms of energy—certainly we want to do that—but in a way that will not compromise the ability for Kansans or any citizen of any State to access affordable energy. This includes impending Federal regulations on hydraulic fracturing, which will continue to play a huge role in my State's energy economy.

In closing, on a larger topic of domestic energy companies, I think it is unfortunate for elected officials to come to the floor—or for that matter make a speech anywhere—and single out specific industries or private U.S. citizens, for that matter, that employ millions of Americans and blame them for our energy woes. I think we are better than that.

Let's remember that attacking their profits is an easy target. It is not going to hurt the few top-level executives at these companies, but it will hurt middle-income Americans and retirees who make up over 90 percent of the ownership of so-called Big Oil or so-called big anything, and rely on their IRAs, pension funds, and mutual funds for their very livelihood. These are not privately held companies, so let's remember who actually owns the companies. It is our constituents, that is who it is.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative 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 ask unanimous consent that the time under the control of the majority be divided as follows: Mr. SCHUMER for 10 minutes, Mr. CARDIN for 10 minutes, Mr. SANDERS for 10 minutes, Mr. LEVIN for 10 minutes, Mr. REED of Rhode Island for 10 minutes, and Mr. MERKLEY for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the legislation authored by my good friend from New Jersey, Senator MENENDEZ. But before I do, I want to call attention to the highway bill and its holdup by our colleagues in the House.

Once again, we are facing the specter of an unnecessary shutdown caused by intransigence in the House Republican caucus, and time is ticking away. Should we reach the March 31 deadline without passing a bill, States' contract authority for construction projects will cease, and 2.9 million jobs will be put at grave risk.

It doesn't have to be this way. Speaker BOEHNER has once again been painted into a corner by the extreme wing of his caucus, which is committed to blocking a responsible highway bill at every turn. It has become clear Speaker BOEHNER has run out of options. He has tried to pass a highly partisan House-drafted highway bill, and that failed. He has tried to pass a 90-day extension on Monday, and that failed. He then tried to pass a 60-day extension on Tuesday, and that failed as well. Now we have learned the House will not vote on any type of extension today either.

Time is running out. Speaker BOEHNER simply cannot pass a transportation bill of any length without Democratic votes, and it is time he accepts that.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there is an easy way out that already has a stamp of approval from some of the most conservative Republicans in Congress. The House could pass the Senate bill. If Speaker BOEHNER put the Senate bill on the floor, there is virtually no question it would pass by a large majority.

You know, this is beginning to look a bit like a replay of the payroll tax cut episode. Just like then, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill by an overwhelming majority. Just like then, the Speaker originally said he would act based on the Senate compromise, but then went back on what he said. Just like then, with the deadline looming, the Speaker is unable to pass an alternative measure and is resorting to asking the Senate for a conference.

We all know how the payroll tax cut saga ended. Republicans started turning on the Speaker and asking him to pass the Senate bill. Now that is happening here too. Earlier this week, three House Republicans from mainstream Republican districts—Congress Members DOLD, BIGGERT, and BASS—joined the growing calls for Speaker BOEHNER to put the Senate's 2-year highway bill on the floor. These are major cracks in the dam, and we believe it is the start of a trend.

Earlier today my friend from New York, PETE KING, also said he would support the Senate bill if the Speaker put it to a vote. Now, that doesn't come as a surprise, as Congressman KING is a strong fighter of New York's transportation needs, including mass transit, which are protected in the Senate bill.

The Senate bill is about two dozen publicly declared Republicans away from having the votes to pass. We believe we have those two dozen Republicans in the House and more. They may not be publicly declared, but they are there. The Senate's 2-year bill can be a lifeboat for Speaker BOEHNER. He should take it before it is too late.

As we speak about the highway bill over in the House, in the Senate Democrats are hard at work taking on Senator MENENDEZ's fine legislation. He was prescient to focus on this idea years ago, and I am glad this bill has come to the floor. I look forward to a debate on the issue.

In the last election, voters gave those of us who have the privilege of serving in this Chamber two distinct mandates. They told us to do two things at once: First, and perhaps foremost, make the economy grow. Create good-paying jobs. Make sure the American dream burns brightly—the dream that says to the average middle-class family: The odds are pretty good if you work hard you will be doing better 10 years from now than you are doing today, and the odds are very good your kids will do better than you.

For that dream, which has burned so brightly in this country for hundreds of years, the candle began to flicker a little in this decade. Median income actually went down even before the recession, which meant even if people had a job—and we know there are millions out of work despite the fact they look hard for jobs—their income was declining. Buying power was declining for the average person. That is difficult. Even people who do have work have a difficult time when they sit down at that dinner table Friday night after dinner trying to figure out how they are going to pay the bills. The costs and needs keep going up, and even when they have a job the income doesn't seem to keep up.

So we first think of the people we have met who are struggling because they don't have jobs, and then we look at the people lucky enough to have jobs who are still having a difficult time making ends meet. We know this Congress must focus like a laser on jobs, the economy, and the middle class. So this is one obligation voters sent to us, and it is a justified one. Secondly, they said, in no uncertain terms, to rein in that Federal deficit—rein it in. They are right.

So that brings us to today, where we are fighting to grow the economy through projects such as those in the highway bill, which will bring good-paying jobs to communities across the country, and we try to rein in this out-of-control deficit by passing the Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act. It would be hard enough to accomplish one of these goals, but we are trying to do both.

We can do it because this choice is simple. It is obvious that at this time, when there are so many needs, that giving oil companies the kind of tax breaks we do makes no sense at all. Getting rid of these corporate subsidies to Big Oil is a no-brainer. At the time these subsidies were passed decades ago, oil was $17 a barrel and there was a worry there wouldn't be enough production. Maybe it made sense in those days to give oil companies an incentive to explore and produce. But with oil hovering at $100 a barrel, and Big Oil reaping record profits, this outdated subsidy makes no sense. Yet it remains on the books, amazingly enough.

It defies logic for this government to spend billions of dollars in tax giveaways to Big Oil; for taxpayers to give dollars out of their pockets every year when they are struggling and Big Oil is making record profits. Believe me, the free market gives the oil companies enough of an incentive to produce. When oil is $100 a barrel, they do not need an extra subsidy from the government to produce. They are going to produce every bit of oil they can. They make huge profits, so they do not need a financial nudge from Washington. At the same time, middle-class Americans get hit with a double whammy. They are paying $70 or more to fill up their gas tanks and then some of their hard-earned dollars are being used to line Big Oil's pockets.

Economists estimate the typical family will pay almost $1,000 more on gasoline this year than last year. But families in my home State of New York and across the country are still struggling to make ends meet. As the economy slowly recovers, they cannot afford to get gouged at the pump.

With billions of dollars worth of tax subsidies, and gas prices at near record highs, it is no wonder the top five oil companies are on track for another record-breaking year. These companies are not only the most profitable businesses in the United States, they are among the most profitable in the world. In the past decade, they took home $1 trillion—not $1 billion, $1 trillion—in profits.

Now, there is nothing wrong with profits in and of themselves. In America, we celebrate success. We want the private sector to survive and thrive. But at a time when the government is looking to tighten its belt, and we are grappling with painful cuts because we have the dual goal of growing the middle class and also reducing the deficit, it boggles the mind that we would continue to subsidize such a lavish industry.

I have watched my colleagues on the other side of the aisle stand idly by while the type of funding that helps our middle class is threatened. Now they are going to choose these subsidies to Big Oil over money to help kids pay for college, over cancer research, over helping our veterans, over keeping our highways and transit systems reliable. Hardly any American would agree with that. Hardly any American—Democrat, Republican, Liberal, Moderate, Conservative—from the Northeast, South, or West would agree.

Try to wrap your head around that. Big Oil is reporting record profits, gas prices are at an all-time high, and we, the American taxpayers, are still subsidizing the oil industry. We don't need the imagination of Lewis Carroll to come up with a more ridiculous scenario. That is why I strongly support and am proud to cosponsor Senator MENENDEZ's Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act.

If our Republican colleagues are serious about deficit reduction, the Menendez bill is the chance to show it. There is no good reason not to support this sensible legislation.

In fact, Speaker BOEHNER himself has said as much. Let's not forget, he was in favor of repealing oil subsidies before he was against it.

So the bottom line is this: At a time of sky-high oil prices, it is unfathomable to continue to pad the profits of oil companies with taxpayer-funded subsidies. The time to repeal these giveaways is now.

Mr. President, 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.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHUMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I want to concur with Senator SCHUMER about his comments on the passage of Senator MENENDEZ's legislation, S. 2204. This legislation is very important for America's energy needs, and I urge my colleagues to allow us to take up this legislation and let's act on it and let's move it to the other body.

There is one commodity just about everyone knows the price of: a gallon of gasoline. People will have a rough idea what a gallon of milk or a dozens eggs or a loaf of bread costs, but they will know to the penny what a gallon of gasoline costs. The price is rising, and people are understandably upset. They are upset because it costs more to fill up at the pump. But they are also upset because crude oil and gasoline price increases affect the price of every other commodity—including milk, eggs, and bread—that has to be transported from where it is produced to where it is consumed. Petroleum is a feedstock used in the production, not just transportation, of so many critical products, including fertilizer.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, EIA, the retail price of a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline was 27 cents higher for the week ending March 5, 2012 than it was a year ago. EIA reports that vehicle fueling costs for the average U.S. household will be about $238 higher in 2012 than 2011.

According to EIA, the price of gasoline has increased dramatically every year—in 2011, higher than 2010, and 2012 is projected to be higher than 2011. This price increase is occurring despite the fact that the United States has stepped up its crude oil production considerably over the past 4 years by 1.3 million barrels per day. Production is at an 8-year high. The United States is the third largest producer of oil, behind the Saudis and Russia, and domestic oil consumption is at a 15-year low. Americans are driving 35 billion fewer miles today than they did in 2010.

If we were producing more and consuming less, then why are prices going up? Supply and demand would tell us that they should be going down. The answer is straightforward: Crude oil and all of the products derived from it, including gasoline, are fungible commodities traded on world markets. Increasing global demand for these commodities is putting a relentless upward pressure on prices.

Growing demand for oil in developing countries has reshaped the global market. Developing nations now consume 47 percent of the world's oil. In 1970, it was 25 percent. The number of cars in the world exceeded 1 billion for the first time in 2010, with one-half of the global growth occurring in China. Beijing adds 1,500 new cars every day.

Another reason for price increases is market uncertainty over crude oil supplies. Much of the world's crude oil is produced in the Middle East and North Africa, regions plagued with turmoil. Right now, the United States accounts for about 9 to 11 percent of the world's crude oil production. This is despite the fact that we have less than 2 percent of the world's total proven oil reserves. We have 2 percent of the world's reserves and we are producing 9 to 11 percent. We are, in fact, drilling here and drilling now, with more oil rigs in operation than the rest of the world combined, according to the Baker-Hughes rig count.

According to economist Steve Baker at the Center for Economic and Policy Research, even if U.S. production could be increased by one-third overnight, that would increase world supply by 3 percent which would lower the price of oil by 7 to 8 percent. As Baker notes:

This is not trivial, but it is not the difference between $2 a gallon gas and $4 a gallon gas.

T. Boone Pickens said it best:

I've been an oil man all my life, but this is one emergency we can't drill our way out of.

A recent Associated Press fact check analysis found that there is no correlation between domestic oil production and the price at the pump. I am for reasonable oil production. We need as much as we can get in a reasonable manner. As reported in the Washington Post of March 28:

A statistical analysis of 36 years of monthly, inflation-adjusted gasoline prices and U.S. domestic oil production by The Associated Press shows no statistical correlation between how much oil comes out of U.S. wells and the price at the pump . . . More oil production in the United States does not mean consistently lower prices at the pump . . . U.S. oil production is back to the same level it was on March 2003, when gas cost $2.10 a gallon when adjusted for inflation. But that's not what prices are now. That's because oil is a global commodity and U.S. production has only a tiny influence on supply . . . Factors far beyond the control of a nation or a president dictate the price of gasoline.

The United States is incapable of having a significant impact on world crude oil and gasoline prices from the supply side of the equation, but domestic oil production does play an important role in bolstering our energy and economic security. We should produce where we can, in a safe and environmentally sensitive manner.

While increasing domestic production and decreasing domestic demand may not be lowering world prices, it does have a significant effect on imports. Our dependence on foreign oil is at its lowest level in 16 years. As a share of total consumption, oil imports declined from nearly 60 percent in 2005 to 45 percent last year, the lowest level since 1995. And nearly one-half of our imports come from the Western Hemisphere nations such as Canada and Mexico, while the Persian Gulf countries account for only 18 percent of our net imports.

The biggest impact the United States could have on oil and gasoline prices is not on the supply side, it is on the demand side. We account for close to 25 percent of the world's petroleum consumption, even though we account for less than 5 percent of the world's population. The best way to continue reducing our demand for crude oil and gasoline would be to: Promote fuel efficiency with higher CAFE standards. We have made progress. We are doing better. We know we can do better than our current standards; Replace conventional fleet fuels with alternative fuels such as propane, natural gas, and biofuels. That will help us consume less oil; Electrify transportation, focusing on hybrid and plug-in electric technologies. Here you get jobs in the United States helping our economy as well as helping our energy security; Boosting transit ridership by increasing funding for the Federal Transit Administration. People don't like to be stuck in traffic jams. Let's have a modern transit system that can help move our people;

Eliminating the tax expenditures that benefit Big Oil could generate over $20 billion over the next 10 years. This is the bill we are talking about, S. 2204, the Menendez bill. It takes the revenues we are giving to the oil industry and uses them to help pay for these green energy measures. This makes a lot of sense. It will hardly be noticed by the big five oil companies—BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, or Shell. They made record profits in 2011, $137 billion. I talked about $20 billion over 10 years. They made $137 billion in 1 year. That was up 75 percent from 2010. From 2001 through the last year, Big Oil has made more than $1 trillion in profits. Every penny increase in the pump increases their profit by another $200 million. So as we are suffering with prices going up, the big oil companies are making more and we are still giving them the subsidies, where we could be using those subsidies to help America develop alternative energy sources.

Big Oil has been getting big subsidies for 100 years. It is time to use that money for developing alternatives to oil. That is the best and most sustainable way to address the high cost of gasoline at the pump. S. 2204 will help us bring down the cost at the pump. It is good for our economy, good for our environment, and good for our national security.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing price of gasoline is clearly causing tremendous hardship to American families all across this country, to small businesses to truckers to airlines and, in fact, to the entire economy. We are trying to claw our way out of this horrendous recession and the high price of oil and gas is not helping us.

I come from a rural State, and it is a State where people often drive 30, 40, 50 miles to work and back home again. Many of these workers make $10, $12, $14 an hour and when the price of gas goes up to $4 a gallon, this is money that is coming right out of their paychecks and it is money they can ill afford to pay. Many of them have seen stagnation in wages, and these high gas prices are doing their families severe harm.

Further, I think the American people understand that our good friends at the oil companies continue to do phenomenally well in terms of the profits they are making. In the last decade, the major oil companies in this country have earned $1 trillion in profits while gas prices have soared.

The Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act we are debating today is a step in the right direction. This legislation would repeal more than $20 billion in tax breaks to the big five oil companies, and use roughly half of this money to extend renewable energy tax credits and use the other half for deficit reduction. Over the past decades, our friends at ExxonMobil, among others, have seen more profits in ExxonMobil in a given year than any other corporation in the history of the world. Meanwhile, many of the largest oil companies over the years have paid little or no Federal income taxes. Let me give you an example.

In 2009, ExxonMobil—again, which has made more profit on a given year than any corporation in history. In 2009, ExxonMobil made $19 billion in profits while receiving a $156 million refund check from the IRS. How is that? A pretty good deal? It made $19 billion in profits, did not pay any Federal income taxes, and yet received a $156 million refund check from the IRS. Chevron received a $19 million refund from the IRS after it made $10 billion in profits in 2009. Not a bad deal. In 2009, Valero Energy, the 25th largest company in America, with $68 billion in sales, received a $157 million tax refund from the IRS. ConocoPhillips, the fifth largest oil company in the United States, made $16 billion in profits from 2007 to 2009 but received $451 million in tax breaks through the oil and gas manufacturing deduction.

At a time when the American people are getting ripped off at the gas pump, the last thing we need to be doing is giving big oil companies massive tax breaks which only add to our deficit and national debt crisis.

In my view, we have to do more than simply end these outrageous tax breaks that Big Oil has enjoyed. In my view, we must also end excessive oil speculation on the oil futures market. There has been a major debate over the last several years as to whether spikes in oil prices were caused entirely by the fundamentals of supply and demand or whether excessive speculation in the oil futures market is playing a major role.

That debate is over. That debate should be put to rest. Let's simply look at the facts. When we were in elementary school and in high school we learned what supply and demand is all about. When supply is high and demand is low, prices go down. When demand is high and supply is low, prices go up. The reality is, today the supply of oil and gasoline is higher right now than it was 3 years ago when the national average price for a gallon of gas was just $1.96 a gallon—more supply than 3 years ago when gas was $1.96 a gallon.

In terms of demand, the demand for oil in the United States today is at its lowest level since 1997. Internationally, during the last quarter of 2011, world oil supply exceeded demand by nearly 2 to 1, while at the same time crude oil prices increased by over 12 percent.

Let me recapitulate: Supply is high, demand is low. Yet oil prices are going through the roof. What is happening? There is a growing consensus within the business community, among economists, among people who study this issue, that the reason oil prices are soaring is excessive speculation on the oil futures market. That is the cause.

ExxonMobil, Goldman Sachs, the IMF, the St. Louis Federal Reserve, the Saudi Arabian Government, the American Trucking Association, Delta Airlines, the Petroleum Marketers Association of America, the Consumer Federation of America—all of these groups are involved in one way or another in studying oil prices. That is what they do because many of them are affected by high oil prices. Others of them are consumer groups studying the impact of high oil prices. All of them have agreed that excessive oil speculation significantly increases oil and gas prices. That is the conclusion more and more observers are making.

Interestingly enough, Goldman Sachs, perhaps the largest Wall Street speculator on the oil futures market, recently came out with a report indicating that excessive oil speculation is costing Americans 56 cents a gallon at the pump. This is the conclusion of Goldman Sachs, perhaps the largest speculator on the oil futures market.

I personally believe and many others believe that number is low, but it is important to understand we now have a major speculator telling us what excessive speculation is doing, in terms of gas prices.

Last year the CEO of ExxonMobil—not one of my best friends, not a company I particularly trust—ExxonMobil's President last year testified at a Senate hearing that excessive speculation on the oil futures market contributed as much as 40 percent to the cost of a barrel of oil. In fact, Bloomberg News reported on March 26, 2012, that:

> According to Commodity Futures Trading Commission data, bets on rising gasoline prices advanced for 11 weeks through March 6 to the highest level in records dating back to 2006.

Gary Gensler, the chairman of the CFTC, has stated publicly that oil speculators now control over 80 percent of the energy futures market, a figure that has more than doubled over the last decade. In other words, the vast majority of oil on the oil futures market is not controlled by people who actually use the product. It is not controlled by airlines or trucking companies or fuel dealers—people who actually use the product. But over 80 percent of the oil futures market is controlled by speculators whose only function in life is to make as much profit as they can by buying and selling oil futures.

Let me list a few of the oil speculators and how much oil they were trading on June 30, 2008, when the price of oil was over $140 a barrel and gas prices were over $4 a gallon. On that day, Goldman Sachs bought and sold over 863 million barrels of oil. Morgan Stanley bought and sold over 632 million barrels of oil. Bank of America bought and sold over 100 million barrels of oil. The only reason these companies were on the oil futures market was to make as much profit as possible. They do not use the end product.

We have to make sure the price of oil and gas is based on the fundamentals of supply and demand and not Wall Street greed. To correct this problem I have introduced S. 2222 with Senators BLUMENTHAL, FEINSTEIN, TESTER, MCCASKILL, KLOBUCHAR, LEVIN, FRANKEN, SHERROD BROWN, CARDIN, MIKULSKI, CASEY, BILL NELSON, BEGICH, and PRYOR.

This legislation—which I have also filed as an amendment to this bill—requires the CFTC to use all of its authority, including its emergency powers, to eliminate excessive oil speculation.

I should point out this emergency directive in our bill is identical—I want my Republican colleagues to hear this—is identical to bipartisan legislation that overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives in 2008 by a vote of 402 to 19, with significant large-scale Republican support.

The Dodd-Frank financial reform bill stipulated very clearly that the CFTC needed to eliminate, prevent, or diminish excessive oil speculation by January 17, 2011, 14 months ago. They have not done it. The CFTC has not obeyed the law, and it is time for Congress to tell them their breaking the law is not acceptable and what they have to do is, in fact, to defend the consumers of this country.

In my view, what this legislation would accomplish is immediately curbing the role of excessive speculation in any contract market within the jurisdiction and control of the Commodities Future Trading Commission on or through which energy futures are trading—that is what this amendment does. It also eliminates excessive speculation, price distortion, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in prices or other unlawful activity that is causing major market disturbances that prevent the market from accurately reflecting the forces of supply and demand for energy commodities.

The bottom line is Congress has to tell the CFTC to obey the law. They have to use their emergency powers to end excessive oil speculation. When we do that, I believe we will see oil prices go down.

I ask for bipartisan support of my legislation and thank all the cosponsors who are already on the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first, let me thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership in this area of excessive speculation. I am going to have a word to say about that in a few minutes. Before he leaves the floor, let me say he has taken a major role in trying to get the CFTC to carry out what the law requires that they do, which is to consider excessive speculation and to put a lid on it. They are authorized to do it without any doubt. That was our intention, and they should get about it.

The bill we are considering would end an egregious example of corporate welfare. Hopefully, we are going to be allowed to be on this bill and be able to defeat a filibuster and vote for cloture sometime, I understand, tomorrow.

At a time when some argue the Federal debt is so out of whack that we need to cut funding for programs to provide food to hungry children or health care to our seniors, surely we ought to be able to agree the most profitable corporations in the country no longer need these enormous subsidies, but here we are. Those oil and gas subsidies have not reduced the price of oil or gas; that is obvious.

The price of gas is complex. I have said many times before, and I will say it again now, the huge increase in speculation plays an important role in the price, the high price of gas. The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, has spent years examining these issues, and the evidence is compelling and overwhelming that financial speculators have played a huge role in driving up gas prices at the same time supply and demand has not significantly changed.

To the extent supply and demand has changed, supply is up and demand is down. So if market forces were really in control, the price of gas would be going down, not up. Some estimate that as much as 50 cents on the price of every gallon of gas is the result of excessive speculation, and another huge portion of the price is simply the wide profit margin for the oil and gas companies.

I agree with my colleagues that we must do what we can to ensure that gas prices do not swing wildly and that they do not pull precious resources out of the all-too-tight budgets of American families. But I think we have to focus on some of the true causes for the rapid rise and the swings in gas prices and not hide behind unfounded assertions that taking away corporate welfare from an already incredibly profitable handful of companies will somehow or other drive up gas prices.

Study after study and expert after expert have told us that removing these subsidies will have no impact on those prices. For instance, Severin Borenstein, codirector of the University of California Berkeley's Center for the Study of Energy Markets, has said ''the incremental change in production that might result from changing oil subsidies will have no impact on . . . gasoline prices.''

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has concluded that removing these subsidies would not impact gas prices because ''prices are well in excess of costs and a small increase in taxes would be unlikely to reduce oil output.''

No, ending these subsidies is not going to impact the price of gas, but maintaining these subsidies does impact taxpayers. These subsidies take money from the vast majority of taxpayers to simply add to the already astronomical corporate profits of oil and gas companies. Just five companies last year reported a profit of $137 billion. Over the past 10 years, the profits of just these five companies have totaled nearly $1 trillion. That is trillion with a ''t.'' These astronomical numbers can only be thought of in connection with the only other number of that size, which is similar, and that is the Federal budget. Congress will soon enact deficit reduction of at least $1.2 trillion or our Nation and our economy will be facing sequestration, facing the slashing of programs that impact nearly every American. That $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction over the next decade is about the same amount as the expected profits for just five oil and gas companies. These companies, which are reporting record profits while paying record-low rates of taxes, should be paying their fair share to help get and keep our economy strong.

While some complain that the United States has such an egregiously high corporate tax rate that companies fail to invest here, the facts show just the opposite. Just a short time ago, the Congressional Budget Office released a report that corporations paid an effective tax rate of just 12.1 percent last year, which was the lowest percentage in decades. Corporations pay extremely low taxes in the United States, and those rates have been steadily declining. Corporate taxes now make up a record-low percentage of all Federal revenues.

The oil and gas subsidies should be cut, and the savings should be used to pay for our Nation's other priorities. That is why I introduced an amendment last year that would have cut just one of these oil and gas subsidies. By eliminating these unnecessary oil and gas incentives and adopting the bill before us, we would be able to preserve or reauthorize a series of other energy tax incentives and grant programs, some of which have expired and others are in danger of expiring, all of which would help promote American energy efficiency and self-sufficiency. Extending these provisions will help lower energy costs for businesses and families, would help diversify our energy strategy beyond oil, and would reduce the dependence on imported oil that undermines our economy and threatens our national security.

Among these important tax provisions is section 45, the production tax credit for electricity produced by wind and other renewable sources; the section 1603 program to encourage the installation of energy equipment; the section 48C advanced energy manufacturing credit that promotes American production of the items used in renewable energy production, such as wind turbines and advanced batteries; the cellulosic ethanol credit to encourage production of fuel through renewable feedstocks; and the tax credit for refueling infrastructure that helps to encourage installation of alternative-fuel infrastructure and electric charging stations in homes and in businesses.

These and other energy provisions, which are in our bill, are vital tools in our battle to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, to substitute alternatives for fossil fuel, and to promote and sustain domestic manufacturing. Energy is a huge cost for businesses in nearly every field. If we can improve energy efficiency, we can lower costs and increase competitiveness. Rest assured that our competitors around the globe are doing that, and we need to do the same or risk falling behind.

Energy efficiency is also vital to national security since our dependence on foreign oil from volatile regions of the globe is an enormous complication to our foreign policy. It leaves our economy vulnerable to actions by unfriendly nations such as Iran. The more we can loosen the grip imported fossil fuels have on our economy, the more prosperous and secure we will be.

Rarely is the choice as stark as it is before us. We can continue corporate welfare for the oil and gas industry, which does nothing but add to those companies' corporate profits and the Nation's deficit, or we can end these subsidies and push for the priorities that will help ensure our energy future and reduce our deficits.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join many of my colleagues in support of the efforts to stop wasting taxpayer money subsidizing oil executives' huge profits. We need to end these wasteful handouts, reduce the deficit, and develop clean energy solutions.

While the oil industry is thriving, making $137 billion—that is billion with a ''b''—in profits last year, Rhode Islanders are paying nearly $3.90 per gallon at the pump. Working families are being are forced to cut back because of high gas prices. In turn, big oil companies should have their wasteful tax subsidies eliminated. We should be working to fuel the U.S. economy, not the oil cartels and big oil companies. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act, which would put a stop to these wasteful tax breaks and use the savings to invest in clean energy technologies that will create jobs, save money for middle-class families, and increase America's competitiveness in the global clean energy economy.

Addressing gas prices and reducing our dependence on oil requires a smart, balanced, and responsible national energy policy. There are no silver bullets, but there are both short-term and long-term steps we should take.

In the near term, we have to be ready to respond to geopolitical events by making it clear that we are prepared to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve if such a measure is necessary because of geopolitical developments.

We need to continue efforts to prevent excessive speculation and speculators from manipulating the market and needlessly inflating energy prices. And I have asked the Commodity Futures Trading Commission—effectively our cop on the beat—to do that and have sought to provide them with the tools and funding to achieve this objective.

We also need to continue investments in smart growth policies to promote mass transit in next-generation vehicles and alternative energy. That is why I have fought for things such as better fuel mileage for cars and smart investments in mass transit. Improved energy efficiency and developing clean energy technologies will help cut our oil addiction.

Working with President Obama, we successfully persuaded automakers to double the fuel efficiency of cars and light trucks. After staying the same for over 20 years, under the Obama administration the average fuel economy of vehicles will be 35.5 miles per gallon by 2016. And the administration has proposed to further increase the standards to 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. Combined, by the year 2025, these standards would save 2.2 million barrels of oil a day and save consumers at the pump an estimated $8,000 over the lifetime of a vehicle. These new standards will reduce the impact of future price hikes by weaning us off oil.

In addition to protecting their unnecessary subsidies, the oil industry continues to push increased drilling as a solution to reducing gas prices. I support safe and responsible oil production, and the administration's efforts to decrease our reliance on foreign oil. U.S. domestic oil production has reached its highest level since 2003. The number of oil rigs in the United States has more than quadrupled in the last 3 years, and U.S. dependence on foreign oil is at its lowest level in 16 years. Indeed, net imports as a share of total consumption declined from nearly 60 percent in 2005 to 45 percent in 2011.

When oil companies tap into resources on Federal property, the taxpayers must be fairly compensated and assured it is done safely and responsibly. Therefore, the oil companies should pay their fair share of drilling royalties and inspection fees to make sure what they do is done right. As chairman of the Interior and Environment Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I worked to secure an increase in the inspection fees for offshore drilling last year, and will push for the same for onshore drilling this year.

For all the sloganeering about domestic drilling, we know we can't drill our way out of this problem. Even the oil companies admit that the biggest factor in the price of gasoline is the cost of crude oil, which is set in the world market. It is not pegged to U.S. production. In fact, an Associated Press analysis of 36 years of Energy Information Administration data shows "no statistical correlation"—their words—between domestic oil production and gas prices.

Again, we need a balanced, well-thought-out national energy policy, one that will help reduce our dependence on oil and the amount paid at the pump. What we should not be doing is continuing to give away billions in corporate welfare to Big Oil while middle-class families see their gas prices rise. It simply is not fair. The oil companies that soak up these subsidies are effectively charging taxpayers twice for the same gallon of gasoline.

Mr. President, middle-class families are struggling. Oil companies are not.

I urge my colleagues to repeal these oil subsidies, make clean energy investments in America, and take commonsense steps to get our fiscal house in order. I urge passage of this very important piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for about 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this is a tough time for Americans. We all know families are sitting around at their kitchen tables struggling to figure out how to make ends meet, but those tough times have not extended to the boardrooms of the five big oil companies.

In 2011 alone, those companies saw more than $100 billion in profits—a sum that is difficult to get your hands around. It is difficult to understand what $1 billion is, let alone $100 billion, not in revenue but in profits. Exxon is sitting on $8 billion that it has not reinvested. Shell is sitting on $13 billion cash in hand. The five largest companies together—BP, Exxon, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, and Shell—have cash resources of $59 billion and have made nearly $1 trillion in profits over the last decade.

Meanwhile, the American taxpayers are not only being forced to hand over larger and larger portions of their paychecks at the pump, they are also being asked to have a share of their taxes go to additional subsidies to these large companies. Let me restate that. When you go to the pump and pay $4 or more, the oil companies make a tremendous profit. There is nothing wrong with making a profit in America, but what seems wrong is that these same companies are then coming to these hallowed Halls and saying: We want a handout from the general fund.

Those companies know there are many other pressing needs in America. Indeed, there are many folks who are hungry across our Nation. There are many families who are hoping but cannot save enough money to send their kids to college. Many families who are pressed by the loss of our manufacturing jobs, our middle-class, living-wage jobs, who are providing for their families on service jobs are having a tough time meeting the mortgage.

Families are struggling, and certainly they would like to see this body say that we understand the challenges so many face. We understand that the cost of tuition for their children is way outpacing inflation, and they are worried about the possibility of their children not having the full opportunities that should be available within our society. They are worried about keeping their homes. They are worried about finding that next job if their current job goes away. But they are wondering why we aren't helping with those problems with these funds instead of giving these funds away to the oil companies. The only explanation they can come up with is that the oil companies are very powerful; they can come here and talk to this Chamber and say: You know, we just want more. It is more important for us to add to the billions we have in the bank than it is to have basic nutrition programs expanded in this country. It is more important for taxpayers to give us money to add to the money we have in the bank than to address the desperate infrastructure funds that are needed around our Nation. It is more important that they give us a handout rather than give a hand up to struggling families in this Nation.

Well, I disagree. I think it is more important to help our families. I think it is more important to help our children. I think it is more important to build our fiscal infrastructure for the economy and for the future. I think it is more important to build the infrastructure through education, the intellectual infrastructure of our Nation that provides both opportunities to individuals and opportunities and strength to our economy as a whole.

There are some who say these giveaways reduce the price of oil at the pump and reduce the price of gasoline. Nothing could be further from the truth. We all know what is driving the price of gasoline. Demand is down because people don't have enough to spend, supply is up, so it is certainly not supply and demand. But what we do have is a big increase in speculators. Speculators are going to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and they are making bets that because of the crisis in the Middle East, because of the issues with Iran, because of the concern about oil flowing out through the Strait of Hormuz, that others will also buy oil futures, so they will buy them, too, and they will make money on the way up, and the result is, for all of us, a higher price at the pump. So if we want to do something about oil prices, we take on the speculators. That is why in Dodd-Frank we gave the CFTC the ability to exclude speculators from that marketplace, to say they have to have positions, they have to have an end use for oil. But they haven't used that power. Maybe we need to pass a stronger bill to suppress the speculation, since the CFTC is not doing its job.

What we know for certain is that giving powerful oil companies the people's money to add to the money they are keeping in the bank, the billions they are sitting on, will not do one thing to drop the price of oil. Let's help American families and not the most powerful who have no need for these funds.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. 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. WICKER. Mr. President, we continue to watch fuel costs skyrocket—shockingly so in the last 3 months—as the average price of a gallon of gasoline breaks records again and again for this time of year. Today, the national average, when I last checked, was $3.91 per gallon.

When President Obama took office, Americans paid $1.85 for a gallon of regular gasoline. Now they are paying more than twice that price, with analysts projecting even higher spikes on the horizon. Some are speculating gasoline prices could top $5 per gallon by summer. Now Senate Democrats propose raising taxes on gasoline production.

We hear a lot about an all-of-the-above energy approach, and that needs to be put into practice. This should include expanding access to America's critical resources. Instead, the President insists on flawed energy strategies such as using taxpayer money for high-risk projects such as Solyndra, while delaying drilling in the gulf.

The President has slowed the permitting process, he has blocked leases, and he has supported higher energy taxes and more regulations. His actions have come at the expense of valuable opportunities for greater domestic energy. The gains our energy producers have made are in spite of the President's policies, not because of them.

The de facto moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico made it clear that strengthening the country's energy security was not a White House priority. The plan the President proposed for offshore oil and gas leasing for the next 5 years would open less than 3 percent of offshore areas for production.

Then there was the rejection by the President of the Keystone XL Pipeline—the subject of an extensive environmental vetting process and a project which would guarantee nearby available oil from our largest trading partner. The President may talk about the need for oil and gas pipelines and even try to take credit for the lower part of the pipeline that did not need his approval, but there is no denying his administration is responsible for roadblocks standing in the way of a better national energy policy.

The 830,000 barrels per day the Keystone Pipeline would transport offers a 7-percent increase to current imports. Vetoing it keeps Americans vulnerable to spiking gas prices and the dangerous whims of energy providers from volatile regions of the world.

High fuel prices can have far-reaching economic effects. According to the Oil Price Information Service, Americans spent more on gasoline in 2011 than in any other year in the past three decades—some $481 billion. For the average household, about 8.4 percent of the family budget or $4,155 went toward filling up at the pump last year. Of course, it is more this year. This means consumers have less money to spend and invest in their local communities, ultimately hurting the economic growth we desperately need.

In 2008, then-Senator Obama said he would have preferred a gradual adjustment of gas prices. That same year, Energy Secretary-to-be Steven Chu told the Wall Street Journal: ''Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels of Europe.'' This is the President's choice for Energy Secretary, someone who wants our gasoline prices to be at the $8-per-gallon level they are experiencing in Europe. This mentality has not changed since 2008. Earlier this month, President Obama said the only solution was to start using less. That lowers the demand and prices come down, according to the President. He later asserted that ''how much oil we produce at home'' is ''not going to set the price of gas worldwide.'' Somehow, using less will lower the prices, according to the President, but producing more will not lower the prices. In other words, the President believes in only half the principle of supply and demand.

Indeed, basic economics tells us otherwise. It tells us that alleviating demand can lower prices but having a greater supply does that too. The argument the President is trying to make that domestic production is inconsequential does not add up. Not expanding production forces American wealth to go overseas because we have to buy our oil from overseas. As Charles Krauthammer recently wrote in the Washington Post:

> Drill here and you stanch the hemorrhage. You keep those dollars within the United States economy.

That is exactly what we need to do in these troubling times.

According to the Institute for Energy Research, we have enough oil within our borders to supply our own fuel needs for 250 years. That is not Senator WICKER talking; that is not a Presidential candidate talking; that is the Institute for Energy Research—250 years we have in the United States. Yet they are being kept off-limits by the administration.

Now the administration wants an $85 billion energy tax hike. This new tax will not translate into cheaper gasoline, a fact my Democratic colleagues have, in fact, acknowledged. It will make it more expensive to produce, drive up imports, and hamper economic investment.

According to a study by the Congressional Research Service, higher energy taxes will increase gas prices and likely increase foreign dependence—exactly what we don't want to do. This would ultimately hurt average Americans who depend on affordable gas prices to get to work every day and businesses—small businesses—that need fuel to transport their goods and services. We have seen how the administration likes to use taxpayer money on high-risk bets such as Solyndra and algae. Instead of gambling on unproven ideas, we should be ensuring economic growth with policies that strengthen our energy capacity. We are blessed to live in a country with plentiful resources and we are far from maximizing America's energy potential.

I have filed amendment No. 1966 to this bill. The amendment would establish a production goal for the Obama administration's 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing plan. It calls for 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day by the year 2027. Compared to today's levels, this increase in production would triple America's current offshore production and reduce foreign imports by nearly one-third. By setting these benchmarks for the output of oil and natural gas, we can make measurable progress toward energy independence.

So I would propound this parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: If we were on the bill at this point, would it be in order for me to offer such an amendment, No. 1966, at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the pending question was S. 2204, it would take unanimous consent to offer an amendment to that measure because there is not an available amendment slot at this time.

Mr. WICKER. I regret that. I hope we can negotiate on both sides of the aisle so amendments such as this can be offered.

To set benchmarks, we could use an additional 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion additional cubic feet of natural gas per day to help us attack this very serious energy problem.

I would simply conclude by saying today's high gasoline prices confirm the urgency of pursuing better energy strategies as demand for oil continues to increase across the globe. Taking steps now is essential to meeting future needs and bringing relief at the pump.

Seeing no one who is seeking to speak—does the Senator seek to speak? If so, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I request an opportunity to speak for up to 10 minutes on the pending energy legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am here to offer a substitute amendment to the Menendez act, which is currently under consideration on the Senate floor. That is S. 2204. The substitute amendment I would like to offer is legislation I have authored along with Senator LUGAR and also Senator VITTER. It is legislation that would approve construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and authorize that that construction proceed. That authority is provided to Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution. With gas prices now close to $4—and going higher—Congress needs to act.

President Obama has turned down the pipeline. He continues to block the Keystone XL Pipeline, and it is time for Congress to act on behalf of the American consumer. Every single American, every hard-working American, is feeling this pain at the pump.

The Keystone XL Pipeline would help us produce more energy supply for our country to help reduce the price of gasoline at the pump. It will help us create more jobs in this country. Close to 13 million Americans are now unemployed. It would help put more of those Americans back to work. Of course, it would help reduce our reliance on oil from the Middle East.

The first chart I have in the Chamber shows what is happening with gasoline prices in the United States. This is over the last 3-year period. This shows the price of gasoline was about $1.87 a gallon when President Obama took office 3 years ago. Today, the national average, I believe stated by AAA, is on the order of $3.91. So the price of gasoline during the Obama administration's tenure has more than doubled. It has more than doubled.

I think there is something like 8 or 9 States now where the average price of a gallon of gasoline is over $4. In places such as Chicago—the President's hometown—I believe the average price is on the order of $4.68. If we go right down to the corner here, right near the Capitol, I filled my car the other day. It cost me more than $100 to fill the tank, and I think the price was $4.39 a gallon.

So what is the solution offered in the Menendez legislation? What is the solution proposed by the Obama administration? What is the solution proposed in this bill we are considering right now on the Senate floor?

What that bill would do is raise taxes on energy companies. It would raise taxes on energy companies. Let's think about this. We are going to raise taxes on these energy companies, so we are going to increase their costs. When we add taxes, that means it not only raises their costs, which will create even higher costs at the pump for American consumers, but it also tends to restrict supply. If we want less of something, and if we want it to cost more, what do we do? We tax it. So this legislation does exactly the opposite of what will help the American consumers with the price of gasoline at the pump.

Instead, we need to increase supply. By providing more supply, we help create downward pressure on gasoline prices. That helps our hard-working Americans not only today but tomorrow as well. Let's talk about that.

Why are gas prices high? It is supply and demand. This is economics. This is about supply and demand. If we increase supply, we put downward pressure on prices. If we increase demand, we put upward pressure on prices. Global demand for oil is growing. We know that. Global demand is growing. So we need to increase the supply; otherwise, that growing demand continues to push gasoline prices higher.

As shown on this chart, here is the amount of crude oil we produce in the United States, along with our good friends in Canada today. That is shown in the first bar on this chart. We can see, it is just below 10 million barrels a day. That is where we are now. With the current policies the administration has in place, we will actually produce less supply in the future—less supply in the future.

Think about that. If gasoline prices are a function of supply and demand, it is not only the supply and demand of today, it is what people anticipate the supply and demand will be in the future. If we have growing global demand—which we know we have—and we have an administration that is constricting supply, then not only do we have an issue in terms of present supply and demand, but we have people going: Look, there is going to be less supply. We know there is going to be growing demand. That puts upward pressure on prices.

So the actions of the administration have a direct impact, a direct correlation with the price of gasoline at the pump. As I showed on the previous chart, under this administration, gas prices have more than doubled. So what we need to do is, we need to produce ''all of the above.'' We need to produce ''all of the above.''

Note that I said ''produce'' it. I do not mean talk about it. I do not mean block it when it comes to building needed infrastructure such as the Keystone XL Pipeline or preventing us from drilling offshore or preventing us from drilling onshore or having the redtape that prevents us from getting permits and the regulatory burden that prevents us from producing more energy. I mean actually doing it—not blocking it, doing it.

This third bar on the chart shows that if we just worked to produce more oil and gas in the United States and Canada, we can produce more than we consume within 15 years. That is just oil and gas. That is not even ''all of the above.'' That does not count producing all the natural gas we have in this country and in Canada or biofuels or other sources. That is just oil and gas if we start working to produce it rather than have the administration continue to block it.

Of course, that is what I am talking about with the Keystone XL Pipeline. The President has studied the Keystone Pipeline, the administration has studied it, the State Department has studied it, the EPA has studied it for 3½ years. Now the Department of Energy has come out and said—they did a study in June of last year—in their study, they said: We need the crude in the United States. We will use the crude in the United States, and it will lower gas prices on the east coast, on the gulf coast, and in the Midwest. That is Secretary Chu, the Secretary of Energy—his Department of Energy produced the report, and that is what it said.

After 3½ years, the President says: That is not long enough. We need more time. The administration needs more time to make a decision. After his own State Department said they would have a decision done before the end of the year—before the end of the year—the President says: No, we need more time, maybe sometime after the election—maybe. We need more time to make the decision.

So Congress said: OK. We will help out. You have expressed concern about the routing of the pipeline through Nebraska. We will pass legislation to kind of give you support and encouragement that says they can go ahead and build the pipeline, and we will give them whatever time they need to reroute Nebraska so there is no issue because that is what you have identified as the problem.

We passed that legislation as part of the payroll tax cut extension. The President denied it, turned it down, blocked it, and he continues to block the Keystone XL Pipeline today.

A couple weeks ago, bipartisan legislation—the very same legislation I am offering in this substitute amendment—was brought to the Senate floor. Bipartisan legislation. We had 11 Democrats who voted with us. Fifty-six votes, well over a majority—56 votes. The reason we did not get 60 votes on the legislation is because that day the President was calling Members of this body, this Senate body, to get them to vote no. So we got 56 votes instead of the 60 we needed.

The very next week—after calling Members of the Senate to get them to vote down this legislation that would authorize moving forward so we could actually bring oil in from Canada, bring more oil from my home State of North Dakota to refineries to help out Americans at the pump—the very next week, after blocking the pipeline, after calling Members of the Senate to get them to vote against it, the President goes to Cushing, OK, and takes credit for this small portion, the southern leg of the pipeline project, saying that somehow he is expediting it.

Interestingly enough, that is the only portion of the pipeline that does not require his approval. But after blocking it, he goes down and takes credit for somehow expediting the portion that was going to be built anyway, while he continues to block the two-thirds that actually brings us more oil.

So go back to what I said just a minute ago. We need more supply. If the policy of this country is to say all of the above, but then go about blocking our ability to produce more supply, guess what happens. Prices go up. Because what counts are the actions.

So the market takes that into account and says: Look, if supply is going to be constrained, then we anticipate higher prices in the future with growing global demand. That is what we see: prices rising at the pump.

Look, we can have energy security in this country. We need to increase our oil production in this country and work with our neighbor to the north, Canada, rather than have them send their oil to China, which is what will happen if we cannot build these pipelines. We need to increase our use of natural gas. We need to do ''all of the above,'' increase renewable fuels, with a market-based approach—a market-based approach—and we need to use technology to drive energy production in this country, and working with Canada, with better environmental stewardship.

What I mean by that, in Canada, oil is produced in the oil sands with in situ, which is the new technique. It is similar to drilling, rather than the old methods—more energy, better environmental stewardship.

Look, we can create a more secure energy future for our country, we can create jobs in America, and we can reduce the price of gasoline at the pump for hard-working Americans. But we need to take commonsense steps, and we need to take them now to produce more oil and gas, to produce more energy of all kinds in this country. We are asking for the President to work with us to do just that.

Mr. President, at this point, I have a parliamentary inquiry: When the Senate resumes consideration of the pending energy tax bill, would it be in order for me to offer my amendment, a substitute amendment, which would approve the Keystone XL Pipeline to help Americans at the pump with the price of gasoline?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the pending question was S. 2204, it would take unanimous consent to offer an amendment to that measure because there is not an available amendment slot at this time.

Mr. HOEVEN. So no amendments will be allowed?

Mr. President, I think that is unfortunate. It is time, it is well past time, to take action on behalf of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I follow my friend and colleague from North Dakota who has been a real leader in these Chambers trying to educate not only those in these Chambers but people across the country as to the value and importance of the Keystone XL Pipeline and what it means to this country, not only in terms of a resource we need but also in terms of jobs and not only construction jobs but what it means to fill a pipeline and provide for a product that goes down to our refineries.

Again, when we are talking about an economic boom, where better to look than to our neighbors to the north, and I thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership on this issue.

I too wish to talk about our opportunity as a nation to do more when it comes to increasing supply within our own country. As has been mentioned on this floor numerous times today, numerous times yesterday, we are in a position as a nation to be doing more to access our own resources, to make us less dependent on countries that do not like us, to make us more energy secure, less energy vulnerable. At a time when the geopolitical scene is so shaky, every step we can take to make us more secure from a national security perspective and an energy security perspective is clearly important.

I have a substitute amendment that I have filed, which I think is important to this debate. I think it is important when we are talking about our access to supply.

What I will discuss in my 10 minutes is not new. Members have heard me talk over and over about the prolific oil resources that reside in Alaska. According to the Energy Department, we have over 40 billion barrels of oil that could be produced up North, providing not only the energy but the energy security, the jobs, and new revenues. We have a pipeline that is built already. We don't need to deal with the permitting issues there. It is there waiting to carry oil. We have overwhelming support from Alaskans.

What we don't have is what is perhaps most important, which is permission from the Federal Government to actually develop our huge oilfields. The biggest on the continent is in the northwest corner of ANWR. For years, we have sought to develop a total of 2,000 acres in what is known as the 1002 area, which Congress set aside back in 1980 to access for energy exploration. They knew then that this area had great potential. The 1002 area is projected to contain more than 10 billion barrels of oil. If you were to put it into context this way, it would be 1 billion barrels a day coming down that pipeline to us from ANWR. That is enough to replace Venezuela or Saudi imports for about 30 years. To think that we could get off of Venezuela and we would not need to go to Saudi Arabia with tin cup in hand because we are producing ourselves here—think about what that means to us. For those who bring about the speculation and argument of what that does to prices, think how this would mess up speculators if you add a million barrels a day online. Instead of embracing this as an opportunity, every excuse in the book has been thrown at us against development. You hear that the environment will be degraded, wildlife will be disturbed, and that despite a better environmental record than just about anywhere else in the world at Prudhoe Bay, we cannot do it. They don't trust us to do it. But for 20 years we have been hearing: Don't go toward ANWR; don't develop ANWR because it will take you 10 years to get that online; therefore, it is not even worth considering.

Even the late-night TV shows talk about it. Jay Leno joked about that and said, ''Democrats said it would take 10 years 10 years ago.'' If you don't get started, it is never going to happen. We are going to keep that money in the ground indefinitely if we don't get moving on it. I don't accept the arguments that have been tossed out, but they have not accepted the facts that we have presented.

I have an amendment that has changed a little bit. It is designed to address this debate. It would prohibit surface development entirely. Yet, it still allows for a very substantial portion of the oil to be accessed from our State lands, with drills reaching beneath the Coastal Plain. We do this by allowing only subsurface occupancy. We use extended horizontal drilling production. Right now, it can reach about 8 miles underground in all directions. As the technology advances, more and more of that refuge's oil could be tapped. Again, we are not going to be occupying the surface. There is no surface occupancy in this legislation. All land-based structures would be located on adjacent State lands. You would not see permanent roads, wells, buildings, and pipelines constructed on the surface of the refuge.

If you were to put together a slide show of development, the surface would be unchanged before, during, and after production. This is a photo of ANWR, and this is probably in the spring because you have tufts of grass coming up through the melting snow. This is what it would look like before, during, and after because we are underneath through the technology.

The amendment I am offering gives the Senate a chance to put reason ahead of rhetoric, policy above politics, when it comes to oil production in this State. It is a chance to end this decades-old dispute about whether development can proceed safely.

We have not just met the opposition halfway here on ANWR; we have met them 90 percent of the way. We have written into the amendment more stringent environmental safeguards than on any other Federal lands. We sacrifice 90 percent of the revenues, which Alaska is entitled to under our statehood agreement. We proposed a 50–50 Federal split. It seems that we are now begging to access a small fraction of the reserves from miles away.

It defies logic to think that, again, an idea, a concept like this would be kept off the table. I realize many are dug in on this issue. I have attempted to change the debate, change the conversation. I would ask the Senate to take a moment to consider how far we have compromised on this amendment and understand why it is different. I hope we can get a vote on it.

I ask, as a point of parliamentary inquiry, when the Senate resumes consideration of the pending energy tax bill, would it be in order for me to offer my amendment No. 1976 at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the pending question were asked regarding S. 2204, it would take unanimous consent to offer an amendment to that measure because there is no available amendment slot at this time.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. The Chair is saying that the amendment slots have been filled by the majority leader, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have another issue I wish to bring up today in the remainder of my time. I have two other amendments I would like the body to consider. I understand what the Chair has just said.

One of the things that I think we recognize is much of our country's production can lag due to an accumulation of redtape due to permitting issues. We know the Federal Government cannot necessarily set global commodity prices, but it can create a situation where capital that might be invested in American mineral production is stranded for long periods of time. That is what we see happening, and it is unacceptable.

What we should not do, particularly in the case of energy and minerals development, is subject a project to an unnecessarily long permitting process. I have an amendment that would begin to remedy this situation, and it would do so by using the very language the President used last week with his executive order, which he signed March 22. My amendment incorporates provisions that had pretty broad bipartisan support on the highway bill considered by this body. These provisions will work. According to the September 2010 report by the Federal Highway Administration, these reforms have cut the time required to complete environmental reviews and have mitigated the delays caused by last-minute legal challenges. What they do, more specifically, is take the President's executive order and put some teeth to it, if you will.

The President simply asked the agencies to consider making certain improvements. What I have done through my legislation is ask for a process for States to nominate items that might be subject to NEPA, allow for a shortening of review periods, and the designation of a single lead Federal agency. It is a situation that I do think rests on a good premise. The President has suggested that this is an approach that needs to be considered when, again, making such improvements.

I suggest that if it is good enough for the President and for our transportation needs, as we have seen demonstrated in the highway bill, then it is good enough for energy, mineral, and infrastructure needs as well.

I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 1985, which includes all of the provisions I have described.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have the bill before us relative to the tax subsidies given to major oil companies—it gives $4 billion a year to companies that registered $137 billion in profit last year. It is such a popular measure that moving to it attracted a 92-to-4 vote in the Senate. We are trying to bring that to closure and get a vote on it. I know the Senator has an amendment she feels is valuable. I don't know the merits of it. I wasn't on the floor to hear the entire explanation. We have just gone through a transportation bill on which for more than a week we entertained an amendment on contraception on that side of the aisle.

We wish to, if we can, limit amendments to relevant issues, and limit them in number and try to actually pass a bill in the Senate, which would be almost historic. I hope we can do it in a bipartisan way. I invite the Senator from Alaska to join us in a conversation about that. Until we can reach agreement on that, I am afraid I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am disappointed we won't have an opportunity to offer the amendments. Several of my colleagues will be coming down to offer their amendments. We have been told that the tree has been filled. The amendment I am proposing—I actually have two. One, as I have described, is probably broader in scope, but I have a second amendment that literally takes the President's executive order and provides instructions to the agencies to do a rulemaking to implement them within 1 year. This is not something that the Senator from Alaska has designed; this is the President's executive order. I think it is designed to get us to an expedited permitting process so we don't have the lag times, whether it is on transportation infrastructure or energy issues.

I think it is a good measure, and I ask my colleague from Illinois, in the effort to work together, which I appreciate, to take a look at this amendment. I apparently will not be able to introduce or call up amendment No. 1986. But again, what that bill would do is pretty simple. It is to codify portions of the President's executive order. The title is ''Improving Performance of Federal Permitting.'' He suggested it, and I thought it made sense. Now we are urging the agencies to provide for an implementation.

Again, I think this debate we are having on the floor this week is an important one. We are focused on the issues that people in this country are talking about. Folks back home are very concerned. I just met with a group of students. One young man is a high schooler from Yakutat, probably driving his first car, and they are paying in excess of $5.50 a gallon at the pump. When you are a 16- or 17-year-old boy, that is pretty high. Even when you are a person our age, that is high. He wanted to know what we are doing as a Congress to help address these issues.

I cannot overstate my disappointment, as we are dealing with these difficult issues in what we all know to be a great deliberative body, that we cannot move to a process where we can allow for fair and germane amendments that I think would help address some of the energy challenges we face, recognizing where we are today.

I see my colleague from Louisiana has joined us on the floor. My time has expired.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer amendments to this bill. Let me assure our colleague from Illinois that they are not amendments about contraception or any other unrelated issue. They are energy amendments, which go directly to one of the greatest challenges all of our constituents, fellow citizens, face, which is the ever-rising price at the pump.

I am glad we are on this Menendez bill, because at least it puts us on that major challenge that faces Louisiana's lower to middle-class families, and those families in Illinois, and all around the country. I bring amendments that are directly relevant to that.

The first amendment has to do with supply. First of all, let me say why I oppose the Menendez bill. It is because when we tax something at a higher level, when we increase the tax on it, we get less of it. So it will produce less energy, in particular less U.S. domestic energy. When we lower supply, we increase the price. It is not only not going to have a positive impact on the price at the pump, it will increase the price and have a negative impact.

I take the opposite approach. We need to increase supply, starting with activity and supply right here at home in the United States. So my amendment, offered along with Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, No. 1965, would do that. It would replace President Obama's current 5-year plan for Outer Continental Shelf leasing with basically the plan that existed previously, which is double President Obama's plan.

So President Obama's plan, which he put in place after coming into office, is about half of the previous plan. It backs us up and turns us around, moving us in the wrong direction. Amendment No. 1965 would turn us back, move us in the right direction, and adopt pretty much that previous plan—to expand our access to our own U.S. energy resources offshore.

UNANIMOUS REQUESTS—S. 2204

So, Mr. President, with that said, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to consideration of S. 2204, the pending energy tax bill, it be in order for me to offer amendment No. 1965, which I have authored along with Senator MURKOWSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Louisiana and I can get into a debate about whether taking $4 billion in subsidies away from five oil companies that reported $137 billion in profit last year is going to change the production of oil, but we will save that for another day.

This amendment, like others, needs to go through the Senator's leader, and with some understanding as to whether we are going to stay in the energy field or go far afield, as we have in previous bills. I am afraid I am constrained, until that conversation takes place between the leaders, to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, that is unfortunate. It is particularly unfortunate because everyone knows our leader and everyone on our side has absolutely agreed to offer energy amendments and give the other side an equal number of energy amendments. We are perfectly agreeable to that, and everybody knows that.

It is in that context that I bring up another energy amendment, our amendment No. 1997. This has to do with another huge opportunity we have in the United States right here at home; that is, enormous oil resources we can get from western shale. Quoting the Institute for Energy Research:

> USGS estimates that unconventional U.S. oil shale resources hold 2.6 trillion barrels of oil, with about 1 trillion barrels that are considered recoverable under current economic and technological conditions. These 1 trillion barrels are nearly four times the amount of oil reserves as Saudi Arabia's proven oil reserves.

That is the potential we have right here in this country—enormous reserves, available now, recoverable now. So what is the problem? Well, one big problem is the Obama administration has canceled all leases to access this oil shale. There was movement to properly, responsibly access that 1 trillion barrels, but that has been canceled under the Obama administration.

My amendment, No. 1997—again, obviously, an energy amendment that can affect prices at the pump—would expedite movement toward that important resource and would get us moving again in the right direction, accessing that U.S. energy resource.

With that said, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to consideration of S. 2204, the pending energy tax bill, it be in order for me to offer that amendment No. 1997.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. For the reasons stated earlier, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, if I can wrap up, again, I think this is unfortunate. Everybody knows Republicans are perfectly willing to limit ourselves to relevant energy amendments. That is what we are doing. That is what we are bringing to the floor. Leader MCCONNELL has offered that. He has offered to have a like number of energy amendments from the Democratic side. What is happening is we are being completely shut down and shut out.

The main issue is not that I am aggrieved, the main issue is the American people are being shut out. The folks I represent—the folks all of us represent—are being shut out from offering good, sensible ideas to at least debate and vote on which would access more American energy, more U.S. energy, to help solve the pressing problem of the price at the pump in that way. Let's control our own destiny in that way.

This is a sensible solution. It is a major solution. It will move us in the right direction.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senator from Illinois on the Senator floor to object to my next proposal.

Mr. President, throughout our history, from time to time we have passed legislation that long after it has served its purpose, if it ever did, still remains on the books. I think one of the great and outstanding examples of that is a law called the Jones Act.

The Jones Act, I am sure, may have had some rationale behind it back in 1920 when it was enacted. I am also sure there is perhaps only 1 American in 1,000 who has ever heard of the Jones Act. But the Jones Act has a direct impact on oil supplies, on the cost of oil, and the cost of other products.

The Jones Act says, incredibly, any product shipped between two U.S. ports—whether it is Honolulu, HI, and San Francisco or one of the gulf coast ports to the northeast or anyplace between two U.S. ports—can only be transported by U.S.-owned, U.S.-built, and U.S.-crewed vessels. Talk about protectionism. There is probably no greater example than this.

The Jones Act, enacted in 1920, has cost consumers—especially in places such as Hawaii where the transportation of goods is long distance—enormous amounts of money. In other words, citing the February 2012 Energy Information Administration Report, there are only 56 tankers that meet the Jones Act requirements, which accounts for less than 1 percent of both the total number and the total deadweight tonnages of tankers in the world. So less than 1 percent of the tankers in the world are able, by law, to operate between two U.S. ports.

So what does this do? Obviously, when we are talking about supply and capacity, it drives up the cost of petroleum. In fact, sometimes it is two or three times the rate of a foreign flagship—again, according to the Energy Information Administration. Not only that, the Jones Act tankers—those 56—aren't always readily available, so the costs can be even higher than we are talking about.

Let me give another example of the harm the Jones Act does to American consumers. In 1999, the U.S. International Trade Commission—not a Republican or Democrat or Liberal or Conservative organization—said a repeal of the Jones Act would lower shipping costs by approximately 22 percent. A 2002 economic study from that same commission found repealing the Jones Act would have an annual positive welfare effect of $665 million on the overall U.S. economy. Given the price of oil, that is probably now close to $1 billion.

The Jones Act adds real direct costs to consumers, as I mentioned, particularly to Hawaii and Alaska. I notice the Senator from Alaska is on the Senate floor. A 1988 GAO report found the Jones Act was costing Alaskan families between $1,921 and $4,820 annually for increased prices paid on goods that were shipped from the mainland. In 1997, a Hawaii Government official asserted that ''Hawaii residents pay an additional $1 billion per year in higher prices because of the Jones Act. This amounts to approximately $3,000 for every household in Hawaii.'' Again, those figures are from 1988 to 1997. Obviously, they are higher today.

Everybody says there is nothing that can be done immediately about the price of oil. My friends, if we repeal the Jones Act, we would have an immediate effect on the price of oil because when we are transporting oil from the gulf coast to the Northeast, and it costs two or three times more if that supply is restricted to being transported only by these 56 tankers, then, obviously—according to figures that are accurate that it costs two to three times more than if we allowed other foreign-flagged ships to move these goods and services, but particularly oil tankers—we could cut the cost of oil, of gasoline, immediately.

So the next time you hear the President of the United States or my friends on the other side of the aisle say there is nothing that can be done now about reducing the price of a gallon of gasoline, understand that we can do so by repealing the Jones Act immediately.

If there was ever a law that has long ago outlived its utility or usefulness, if it ever had any, it is this law passed in 1920. Only American built? We can't even buy another one—a tanker or a ship—that is built in another country and not have it fall under the Jones Act, even if it is American owned and with an American crew. Amazing.

What I am leading to, obviously, is that we should repeal the Jones Act. If not repeal it, then waive the Jones Act. If not fully waive it, then waive it just for the transport of oil, for oil and gas tankers. If that is not enough, let's just waive it for 6 months. Couldn't we just do that for 6 months?

I know what the response of the Senator from Illinois is going to be. That is his duty on the Senate floor, and I respect that. But, my friends, the price of a gallon of gasoline is now, this March, according to media reports, the highest it has been in history. Depending on what happens in a lot of different areas of the world—particularly the Middle East and what happens in Iran and other things that are going on in this very dangerous world we are living in today—it could go considerably higher.

So why don't we take a commonsense approach and at least for 6 months waive the requirements of the Jones Act for only oil and gasoline tankers—for just 6 months. It seems to me that would make a great deal of sense.

I know all four of my unanimous consent requests on these amendments are going to be denied. But, first of all, I think the Jones Act should be repealed completely. If it isn't to be repealed, couldn't we at least waive the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade for oil and gas tankers? If we can't waive it permanently for that, can't we waive those restrictions for 6 months? We are discussing energy and the price of oil. Can't we waive the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade for oil and gasoline for 6 months.

So with the indulgence of my friend from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to consideration of S. 2204, the pending energy tax bill, it be in order for me to offer—I want to offer them all—my amendment No. 1948, which is, as I described, an amendment that would waive the Jones Act restrictions. In other words, it would allow a foreign-flagged tanker to move oil and gas—a waiver for 6 months to move just oil and gas—so that we can immediately reduce the cost of transportation, which would then translate itself at the pump at every gas station in America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection? The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I believe the shipbuilding industry in Arizona is about the same size as it is in Illinois, so I don't come to this issue with any particular hometown or home State view, and I am open to the Senator's suggestion. But I would say at this moment we are clearly focused on doing one thing; that is, eliminating the $4 billion annual subsidy to the five big oil companies that registered $137 billion in profits last year. Moving to this measure was voted favorably by 92 Senators, and we are trying to move this to a vote. Perhaps we can move to another issue—the ones the Senator is proposing—at another time, but at this point, I have no other alternative but to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I always enjoy a little dialog between myself and the Senator from Illinois. I hope he would have the same passion concerning all subsidies, including the outrageous and disgraceful subsidies that—and there is a lot of solar in the State of Arizona—a lot of solar. I will stop here, but if we are going to repeal the gas and oil subsidies, let's repeal them all. Let's repeal them all.

I am not sure—again, the logic that says that if we are able to immediately reduce the cost of oil by repealing the Jones Act, which then would reduce the cost of transportation, would then reduce the cost of gasoline—why should we out of hand reject such a motion or an effort to do so?

But I understand what the position of the majority and the distinguished Democratic leader is, and I know others are waiting, so I thank the Senator and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time remains.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, President Obama often boasts about oil production he really had nothing to do with. My amendments I am bringing forth today would allow him to be proud of his own record instead of his predecessors, and that is why I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to consideration of S. 2204, the pending energy tax bill, that it be in order for me to offer amendments Nos. 1956 and 1957. Amendment No. 1956 would accelerate permitting of oil and gas exploration on our Federal public lands, and amendment No. 1957 would require Federal agencies to use existing environmental review documents for oil and gas permitting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the reason I come to the floor today is to speak on behalf of these two amendments I have filed to S. 2204.

A few weeks ago, we learned that oil and gas production on Federal public lands and waters is down. Specifically, we learned there was a 14-percent decrease in oil production on Federal public lands and waters from 2010 to 2011 and an 11-percent decrease in gas production from 2010 to 2011.

On March 14, Bob Abbey, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, testified about this before the Appropriations Committee. He explained that there had been ''a shift [in the oil and gas production] to private lands to the east and to the south where there is a lesser amount of Federal mineral estate.''

That is why amendment No. 1956 would accelerate permitting for oil and gas exploration on our Federal public lands, and that is why I just offered that. I took a look at the amendments and the discussion on the bill on the floor, and that is why specifically I offered an amendment that would rescind the administration's rules requiring what are called master leasing and development plans. These regulations were put into place over 2 years ago by the Secretary of the Interior. It is unclear why the Secretary issued these regulations. They add more redtape, they cause more bureaucratic delay, and they slow down American energy production. This amendment would also require the administration to set goals for oil and gas production on Federal public lands. It would ensure that the United States maintains or increases onshore oil and gas production.

I have also filed a second amendment, No. 1957, which would require Federal agencies to use existing environmental review documents for oil and gas permitting. When we take a look at this amendment, this would expedite the time it takes to prepare environmental analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act, often known as NEPA. Too often, NEPA delays onshore and offshore exploration. My amendment provides a commonsense solution. It requires agencies to use, in whole or in part, an existing environmental review document if the existing document was completed for a permit that is substantially the same as the permit under consideration. This amendment doesn't exempt agencies from complying with NEPA, and it does not provide for categorical exclusions. It simply requires agencies to use their previous work so they don't have to reinvent the wheel.

I am disappointed that the majority continues to prevent the Senate from doing its job and that we heard an objection to these amendments. High gasoline prices are causing hardships for American families and American businesses.

My Republican colleagues and I filed a number of amendments to S. 2204. We would like to have votes on these amendments. We would like to take steps to increase American oil production. Instead, as we just saw, the majority says no. ''No'' to more American energy, they say; ''no,'' they say to jobs; and ''no,'' they say to strengthening our energy security. We can do better, and it is my hope that we will.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for no more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleagues who have come down to the floor this afternoon for their efforts to offer what I believe are very substantive, very meaningful amendments to the legislation that is before us. I think we can condense the message you have heard here this afternoon pretty easily.

The fact is that the bill before us is highly misleading, and I don't believe it will work. The legislation that has been introduced, S. 2204, is not going to put an end to Federal subsidies for oil and gas producers because there are none. There are no subsidies here. The oil and gas industry actually sends money to the Federal Government to the tune of tens of billions of dollars each year, and it is not the other way around. Basic tax deductions that allow businesses to retain more of their earned dollars is not the equivalent of handing them a check. So I think that is the first thing we need to get out on the table and make very clear.

The second point I want to reinforce is that S. 2204 is simply not going to work. By definition, increasing costs will not lower prices. There is nothing I can think of that, if we tax it more, it will make it more affordable and more abundant. It just doesn't work that way. And judging from both history and some recent international examples, it is virtually certain that S. 2204 would have damaging effects on this country.

Back in 1980 the Carter administration imposed a windfall profits tax. We remember that. This was a tax that was imposed on domestic crude oil. According to the Congressional Research Service, that tax reduced domestic oil production, it increased our dependence on foreign nations, and it collected far less in revenue than was expected.

The example that is more current on the international scene is one I spoke to yesterday, and that is the example in Great Britain. A year after raising its oil tax rates, production declines in Great Britain have increased from 6 percent per year to 18 percent per year. As a result, Great Britain is reversing that course. They are now planning to offer new incentives to encourage producers to return to the North Sea.

So all we need to do is look at a real-time example of what one country did in an effort to deal with high gas prices. They increase the taxes, and investment and production goes overseas. Now they are turning the corner on this, and they are working to reduce their taxes.

I think there is clearly a better way. The other side of the aisle has refused to even consider amendments that will increase Federal oil and gas production, create good jobs in this country, generate billions of dollars of Federal revenues at a time that we desperately need them, restrain if not reduce gasoline prices, and increase our domestic energy security.

We believe very strongly that the solution to these many problems should be a reasonable combination of increased domestic production, for which we have huge world-class untapped resources that are still locked up by our Federal Government—America could be the world's largest oil producer, and we could be independent of OPEC. That is real. That is achievable. But we have to set our mind to it, we have to make that happen, and we have to have the Federal Government get out of the way or help us with the right incentives to do so.

The hundreds of billions of dollars in Federal revenues from increased production could, and should, help support the research and the development of our renewable resources, our alternative energy, as well as efficiency and conservation. We know that building out the energy of the future—renewables, alternatives—is expensive. How are we going to fund it? Well, many of us believe that resources that come from expanded production could help us with that. Yet what we are presented with today is a bill that does nothing more than raise taxes—raise taxes on an industry that has created good jobs, is providing us with the resource that we need, and we are not even allowed to offer a single amendment to produce one additional drop of American oil. I think that is unfortunate. I wish it were otherwise.

But I do think the debate, the discussion we have had on this floor in the past couple of days has been good and helpful in helping to educate the American public in terms of what we truly have as a nation in terms of our capacity and our capability to produce if given the opportunity.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. What is the parliamentary situation at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority retains 16 minutes in time.

Mrs. BOXER. I am confused a little bit because didn't the minority get extra time? Did they not get extra time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asked consent and no one objected.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, I would ask consent that I have an additional 5 minutes on the 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. So, Madam President, I think it is very important that we understand what we are trying to do here.

The Senator from Alaska said it has been a good debate. Yes, it has been a good debate, but let me tell you what is not good. What is not good is that Big Oil is getting corporate welfare. Big Oil is ripping us off at the pump. They never had greater profits. We are being asked to sacrifice and pay more at the pump because of instability in the world, because of problems with the refineries, even though we have never drilled as much as we are drilling now. Big Oil exports our oil now. We have never had as many exports as we have now.

Big Oil gets billions of dollars of subsidies, so big that I would tell you, $2 billion a year in U.S. tax breaks. Let me tell you, to explain how that compares to something we do that is very near and dear to my heart and to every mother and father, grandma, grandpa, or aunt and uncle, we put about $1 billion a year into afterschool programs, and we have millions of children waiting—$1 billion a year on afterschool programs while we give away $2 billion a year to the most, shall we say, successful companies in America.

I want to show you what I am talking about because I don't want people to think this is rhetoric. These are the facts. When my Republican colleagues come on the floor and defend these profits, let's talk about what they are.

Now, remember, we have been in a deep recession for several years now. Remember that President Obama and we had to confront the loss of 800,000 jobs a month. Now, thank goodness, he has turned it around—we have turned it around. It is still not good enough but we were in the worst situation. During that time, small businesses went out of business. People lost their homes. If it were not for the leadership of the President, we would have lost the auto industry in America. Thank you, Mr. President, for saving the auto industry in America. Thank you for that. I was proud to vote for that even though I had a lot of problems with the auto industry not moving quickly enough to fuel efficient cars. Now they are doing a great job with it.

During that time when Americans were suffering, we were bleeding all these jobs and even now, just getting back on our feet, what has happened to Big Oil while they have raised our prices at the pump? In 2009, all the five oil companies made $64 billion. In 2010, Big Oil made $76 billion, and in 2011 they made a whopping $137 billion. So they went from $64 billion in 2009 to $137 billion in 2011, and my Republican colleagues are crying bitter tears for them. Oh, let's keep giving them that $2 billion a year.

Why would we do that when we are sacrificing and our constituents are paying more at the pump and Big Oil is profiting from it? There is no reason for this kind of increase at the pump. There is no reason for it. Look at what is going on here. If they made the normal profits, we could have some relief at the pump. But, oh, no. So now the Republicans are going to reward them by allowing them to keep these subsidies.

That started a long time ago. That started in the 1980s, most of it, because we wanted to help them get moving. How much more do they have to earn before we say they can get off corporate welfare? You talk about welfare queens, here it is. And my Republican friends defend giving these people, who have ripped us off at the pump, billions of dollars of subsidies.

They are exporting the oil they recover here. They will not keep it in the country. We had a proposal for the XL Pipeline to keep the oil in the country. My friends on the other side of the aisle voted against it. They don't care, they just want these companies to have their way, to do with it what they want.

If they want to send our oil to China, fine, that is what they want. But they also want to keep their subsidies. It is not right. I want to see these subsidies done with and I want to see us invest in alternatives to these big oil companies that hold us by the throat. I want to have alternatives.

I have been all over this country looking at the alternatives we are developing now. We know, for example, in Brazil they use sugar cane to create their gasoline and they are completely free from imported oil. That is the kind of thing we need to do. I am fortunate that I drive a hybrid vehicle and I get 50 miles to the gallon, so I don't go in for gas that often. But when you go in there, it is a shock. We want to have cars—let them be big cars. If people need that for their families, I understand it. I have grandkids. I know what it is to put your grandkids in a small car. It is hard. We need to have larger cars. They need to be fuel efficient. We are going to get there. We are getting there already.

Isn't it better to take that money away from people who are ripping us off at the pump, away from the corporate welfare queens here, and put it into alternatives so our people are no longer victims to their prices? That is the fight we are having. That is the debate we are having.

On the other side they say drill, baby, drill. You know what, I am for drilling where it makes sense. Do you know how many acres the oil companies are holding now that they have not drilled upon? It is pretty amazing. My friends say open the Arctic to drilling—a precious environment, God-given, placed in a refuge by I believe it was Dwight Eisenhower. They want to go in there and ravage it. Why don't they drill on their nonproducing acres? It looks like 75 million nonproducing acres, onshore and offshore, on which they hold leases.

Oh, no, that is not good enough for them. They are only drilling on 25 percent of the leases they hold, of the acreage they hold in those leases. How about "use it or lose it," instead of "drill, baby, drill"? Drill, baby, drill in here. Don't go into the coast of California where they want to go, or Washington, or Oregon, where we have fishing, tourism, recreation.

There are so many people here to whom I listen who make the arguments for the oil companies. I am so tired of it. How about speaking up for the American people who are getting brutalized at the pump? How about speaking up for the people who make their living off of a beautiful, pristine environment?

Oh, by the way, many jobs in my State, over 400,000 jobs, are related to a pristine coastline, and they don't care about that on the other side. They want to open it, push these people out of the way and create a few jobs—because there are far fewer jobs created from drilling. As President Obama has said many times, and the other side gets rankled: We only have 2 percent of the world's proven oil reserves and we use about 20 percent of the energy. You do the math, as the President said. You could drill in your grandmother's bathtub, you could drill in the Great Lakes, you could drill anywhere you want—you are not going to find enough oil.

So let's get off foreign oil, let's tell the oil companies to drill, baby, drill where they have the acres and let's look at these prices and let's understand—we will look at it again—the profits of Big Oil. They are crying all the way to the bank, as my dad used to say.

Look at this. In the height of the recession they are making record profits and crying to keep their subsidies and my Republican friends are crying right along: Oh, here, have a tissue. We are so sorry for you, even though we have to turn away millions of children from afterschool programs because we do not have more than $1 billion to spend on it. They are giving away $2 billion a year. That is just one example.

I hope we vote for the Menendez bill. I hope we vote tomorrow on that, to stop the filibuster, to vote it up or down. What a message of hope it will send to the American people, that we are willing to stand up to the biggest powers that be, that we are willing to fight for the average American, that we are not in the pockets of Big Oil. You don't need to give American taxpayer dollars to Big Oil. It is absolutely ridiculous. We don't have to allow them to drill in pristine areas when they will not even drill in areas that they have had under lease for years. And let's stop them from exporting the oil. We need it. Let's keep it here.

By the way, if they keep on ripping us off like this and getting rewarded for it from my Republican friends, let's release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and let's increase the supply and let's see prices go down.

Let's look at the CEOs of Big Oil for a minute, these poor guys who are fighting for the subsidies. Let's look at them. CEOs for the big five made more than $14.5 million in total compensation in 2010. This is it, average compensation. That is 307 times the average salary of a firefighter; that is 273 times the average salary of a teacher; that is 263 times the average salary of a policeman; that is 218 times the average salary of a nurse. But they need subsidies for their companies and they need to rip us off at the pump so they can make a little more money—$14.5 million isn't enough for a poor oil company executive. Give me a break. And stop giving them a break because they don't need this break.

We have an opportunity to stand for what is right and I hope we take it. Right now we want alternatives to Big Oil. We want competition for Big Oil. We want to be able to become energy independent. So let's stop these taxpayer handouts. The oil companies do not need them. Let's start investing in America's energy future which, by the way, that kind of investment creates many jobs at a time that we need to do that.

HEALTH CARE

I want to switch topics here for the remainder of my time and talk a minute about health care and then close with a little bit about the highway bill over in the House and the struggle over there to get their work done.

I ask how many minutes I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Chair advise me when I have 2 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so advise the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we all are watching what the Supreme Court is going to do in terms of the health care bill they have before them. What I want to do today is completely stay away from that argument and talk about what the health care bill is doing now, right now as we speak, because people tend to get involved in mandates, and if it is constitutional, and how does it work and so on. I want to talk about what the Obama health care plan is doing for my people at home, your people back home, and the people of this country right now.

As we stand here today, over 5 million seniors have saved more than $3 billion on their prescription drugs. The way it worked before this bill was passed, you would use up a certain amount of money and then you would fall into this coverage gap that they call a doughnut hole, and just when you are at your sickest point, you get no help. A lot of our seniors were not taking their medicines at that critical point because they could not afford the full cost; they were cutting the pills in half and praying. It was a sad situation. Because of health care reform, we have these seniors being able to keep their medications flowing. Last year in my State, 300,000 seniors were able to save $171 million in their costs.

Let's look at that again. As a result of Obama health care, which I proudly supported, already 5 million senior citizens are able to afford their prescription drugs—your mother, your father, your grandma, your grandpa. That is important. What is going to happen to these people if this whole thing gets overturned? They will get sick and they will not have those medications.

In addition, what else is happening—2.5 million young Americans are now covered because they can stay on their parents' health plan until they turn 26. Without this law, when you graduated from college you were out of luck, and you had to find your own health care. The Obama plan said you should be able to stay on your parents' health plan until you turn 26. I cannot tell you how many people have written to me to thank me for that.

So over there in the Supreme Court they are talking about legalese, and I appreciate that. They are talking about severability, and they are talking about a lot of interesting things. One thing I want to talk about is what is going to happen to 5 million senior citizens who are able to stay on their medication as a result of the Obama health plan.

What is going to happen to the 2.5 million Americans who are young who can stay on their parents' plan until they are 26 if something happens over there across the street in terms of this legal case? In California 335,000 Californians have benefited from that young person being able to stay on their parents' insurance provision.

What is going to happen to 54 million Americans who now have access to free preventive care, such as screenings for colon cancer, mammograms, and flu shots? This is new, folks. Before we didn't get free prevention. We had to pay a copayment. I have to tell you, as I lived my life and I have seen the tragedy of cancer, I have learned very clearly that if you take care of yourself and have mammograms and colon cancer screenings, your life can be saved.

What is going to happen to 54 million Americans who have that preventive care now if the Supreme Court strikes it down? Out of that 54 million, 6 million Californians have gotten these screenings and vaccinations. I will close with health care on this story.

I don't know how many people realize this, but before the Obama health care plan there were caps on insurance policies. Maybe they were a million-dollar cap or a half-million-dollar cap. Before I had different insurance, I had a cap on my husband's policy. What happened at that time is, if you used up enough health care, you were finished at a certain point.

I want to tell you the story of Julie Walters of Nevato, CA. She wrote to me last year about her 3-year-old daughter Violet who suffers from a severe form of epilepsy. She wrote that Violet could hit her lifetime limit in 5 years. So here is a little baby who is reaching her lifetime limit, and her mom wrote:

> A lifetime limit on insurance is a limit on Violet's lifetime, and that is immoral.

Because of health care reform, there is no longer a lifetime limit. So I wanted to point this out and so many other things that are totally essential to our people that are at stake across the street.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

In closing, before we reach our full time, I want to call on the House to take up and pass the Senate Transportation bill. There are 3 million jobs at risk. They cannot get their act together. Allow a vote on the bipartisan Transportation bill and then leave for your vacation. But don't just give us these extensions which are, frankly, death by 1,000 cuts. We already know of six or seven States—including those in the Northeast—that are laying people off because they don't have certainty with the Transportation bill.

So I thank you very much. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for allowing me to finish.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MIRANDA DU TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SUSIE MORGAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Miranda Du, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, and Susie Morgan, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally but am I correct if we did the full 60 minutes, we would start the first vote at 5:35 p.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we divide the time equally between now and 5:30 and the vote be at 5:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today the Senate will finally vote on the nominations of Miranda Du to fill a judicial emergency vacancy in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada and Susie Morgan to fill a judicial vacancy in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Both nominations have the bipartisan support of their home state Senators, and were reported by the Judiciary Committee over 4 months ago. The Senate is still only considering judicial nominations that could and should have been confirmed last year. The judicial vacancy rate remains nearly twice what it was at this point in the first term of President George W. Bush.

Last week, I noted an article about the ''crushing caseload'' that the Federal courts in Arizona currently face. In that article, the Chief Judge of Arizona's Federal trial court noted that they are in ''dire circumstances'' and that they are ''under water'' from all the cases on their docket. Like the district court in Arizona, the one in Nevada is also in desperate need of judges, as evidenced by its designation as a judicial emergency. As that same article noted, an insufficiency of judges ''lessens the quality of justice for all parties involved.'' This is why it is so crucial that we confirm these nominees as soon as possible.

Delay is harmful for everyone. An editorial from the Tuscaloosa News last week stated that ''[D]elays are objectionable in themselves: They deprive the courts of needed personnel, slow the administration of justice and deter well-qualified candidates from agreeing to be considered for the bench.'' I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the article, entitled ''Congress needs to stop judicial partisan games,'' in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. The needless 4-month delay in the consideration of these nominations is another example of the delays that have been caused by Senate Republicans' unwillingness to agree to schedule these nominations for votes last year. As the editorial from the Tuscaloosa News noted: ''[T]he determination of Senate Republicans to delay President Barack Obama's judicial nominees—even those who have won bipartisan support from the Judiciary Committee—is emblematic of the polarization that also has sabotaged efforts of the two parties to work together on numerous other fronts.'' The editorial concludes by urging that there be ''no more partisan games.''

A recent memorandum from the Congressional Research Service confirms what we have long known: The delay and obstruction from Senate Republicans have resulted in President Obama's judicial nominees waiting much longer for a floor vote than judicial nominees under the past four Presidents. These tactics, of course, have resulted in a much lower number and percentage of confirmed judicial nominees under President Obama—despite the fact that President Obama's judicial nominees have by and large been consensus nominees.

The consequences of these months of delays are borne by the more than 150 million Americans who live in districts and circuits with vacancies that could be filled as soon as Senate Republicans agree to up or down votes on the 17 judicial nominations currently before the Senate. Our courts need qualified Federal judges, not vacancies, if they are to reduce the excessive wait times that burden litigants seeking their day in court. It is unacceptable for hardworking Americans who turn to their courts for justice to suffer unnecessary delays. When an injured plaintiff sues to help cover the cost of his or her medical expenses, that plaintiff should not have to wait 3 years before a judge hears the case. When two small business owners disagree over a contract, they should not have to wait years for a court to resolve their dispute.

Today, we can finally end the needless delays on these two qualified nominees. Miranda Du was born in Vietnam. She left the country with her family by boat in 1978 and immigrated to the United States after spending a year in refugee camps in Malaysia. If confirmed, she will become the first Asian Pacific American appointed to the Federal bench in Nevada. Both of Nevada's Senators, the Majority Leader and Republican Senator DEAN HELLER, support Ms. Du's nomination. Senator HELLER has said that Ms. Du will ''make an outstanding district court judge.'' She also has the support of the Republican Governor of Nevada, Brian Sandoval; the Republican Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, Brian Krolicki; and the Republican Mayor of Reno, Robert Cashell; each of whom has personally worked with Ms. Du. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letters of support from these individuals at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. LEAHY. Governor Sandoval fully supports Ms. Du's nomination. In his recommendation letter, he wrote that when Ms. Du appeared before him when he was a judge, she ''was always well prepared and represented her clients with integrity and distinction.'' He further stated that she had his ''full support'' for confirmation as a Federal district judge. Ironically, he was the judge in the one case on which Republicans rely to criticize the nominee. As the judge, he had overlooked the jurisdictional argument when initially deciding against dismissing the case. The Magistrate Judge on the case issued sanctions, but Governor Sandoval ultimately struck the motion for sanctions as moot when Ms. Du and her legal team resolved the dispute with the third-party. In addition, Ms. Du testified candidly about the incident during her Committee hearing and in her response to the Questions for the Record, acknowledged that she had ''learned a great deal from this experience.'' Incidents like this have never held up a nomination before in the past, and it should certainly not hold up Ms. Du's nomination. President Obama's nominees should not be held to a different or new standard.

She has spent her 17-year legal career in private practice as a partner at a law firm in Reno, Nevada. She currently serves as chair of the firm's Employment & Labor Law Group. Ms. Du's story is compelling. She was selected by Super Lawyers as a 2009 ''Mountain States Rising Star'' and was named as one of the ''Top 20 Under 40'' Young Professionals in the Reno-Tahoe Area in 2008. That she is being opposed because she and her legal team filed a third-party complaint on behalf of a client in one case is to hold her to a new standard than Senate Republicans have utilized with other nominees and other Presidents in the past.

The other nominee we consider today is Susie Morgan. She has worked in private practice for 30 years. Her nomination has the bipartisan support of Louisiana's Senators, Democratic Senator MARY LANDRIEU and Republican Senator DAVID VITTER. Following her law school graduation, Ms. Morgan clerked for Chief Judge Henry A. Politz of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. She was unanimously rated as qualified by the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary to serve as a Federal judge in the Eastern District of Louisiana. Her nomination was approved unanimously by the Judiciary Committee last November.

The Senate needs to make real progress, which means going beyond the nominations included in the agreement between Senate leaders to include the 17 judicial nominations currently before the Senate for a final vote and the eight judicial nominees who have had hearings and are working their way through the Committee process. There are another 11 nominations on which the Committee should be holding additional hearings during the next several weeks.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Tuscaloosanews.com, Mar. 22, 2012]

EDITORIAL: CONGRESS NEEDS TO STOP JUDICIAL PARTISAN GAMES

Delays in the confirmation of federal judges aren't uppermost in Americans' minds when they complain about partisan dysfunction in Congress. But the determination of Senate Republicans to delay President Barack Obama's judicial nominees—even those who have won bipartisan support from the Judiciary Committee—is emblematic of the polarization that also has sabotaged efforts of the two parties to work together on numerous other fronts. And the delays are objectionable in themselves: They deprive the courts of needed personnel, slow the administration of justice and deter well-qualified candidates from agreeing to be considered for the bench.

So it's a hopeful sign that Republicans have agreed to vote on 14 judicial nominations by May 7. It would be heartening to report that the Republicans agreed to the votes because they repented of the obstructionism of some of their members, but in fact their agreement followed a power play by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D–Nev., who filed cloture motions to try to force votes on 17 nominations.

Rather irrelevantly, Republicans had complained that Reid hadn't made judicial confirmations a priority. Now he has. Republicans also have faulted the Obama administration for being slow to fill vacancies on district and appeals courts. That is a fair criticism. There are 81 vacancies but only 39 pending nominees (including two for future vacancies). But it is Republicans who have withheld the unanimous consent necessary for nominations already approved by the Judiciary Committee to move forward expeditiously and without prolonged debate. The latest pretext for delay was the desire to protest Obama's recess appointments to federal agencies, but Republicans have been reluctant to allow Democrats to score a political point by promptly confirming Obama's judicial nominees.

When Reid first proposed swift action on the nominations, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R–Ky., complained: ''This is just a very transparent attempt to try to slam dunk the minority and make them look like they are obstructing things they aren't obstructing.'' But then McConnell added that ''this is going to, of course, be greeted with resistance.'' In other words, if you accuse us of being obstructionist, we'll make you pay by being obstructionist. This is partisanship at its pettiest.

The White House complains that the Senate has taken four to five times as long to confirm Obama's nominees as it did to approve George W. Bush's. Nevertheless, several of Bush's nominations were delayed or derailed by Senate Democrats, including eminently qualified appeals court nominees whom they feared might be potential Republican appointees to the Supreme Court.

Controversial or not, every judicial nominee deserves serious consideration by the Senate and an expeditious up-or-down vote—and no more partisan games.

EXHIBIT 2

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, August 22, 2011.

Re Recommendation of Miranda Du

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: It is with great pleasure that I recommend Miranda Du for the United States District Court Judge, District of Nevada.

As long as I have known Miranda, she has exhibited great character and is well respected in the legal community. During my tenure as a U.S. District Judge, each time Miranda appeared before me, she was always well prepared and represented her clients with integrity and distinction.

Miranda Du will make a fine U.S. District Judge and therefore has my full support. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincere regards,

BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor.

OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR,
Carson City, NV, August 23, 2011.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: I am writing in enthusiastic support of Miranda Du's nomination to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

As Nevada's Lieutenant Governor, I have the privilege of serving as Chairman of the Nevada Commission on Economic Development (NCED), whose mission is to promote a robust diversified and prosperous economy for Nevada. In this capacity, I have served with Ms. Du since she was appointed to the Commission in July 2008.

As a NCED commissioner, Ms. Du has demonstrated many qualities that will make her an ideal Federal District Court Judge. She is intelligent, inquisitive, reliable and dedicated. She is an active and involved commission, always prepared and informed, and she is not afraid to ask tough questions. She conducts herself in a professional and dignified manner. I think that both Nevada and the United States will benefit from Ms. Du's appointment to the Federal Bench and I strongly encourage the Senate to confirm Ms. Du.

Best regards,

BRIAN K. KROLICKI,
Nevada Lieutenant Governor.

CITY OF RENO,
Reno, NV, August 12, 2011.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND GRASSLEY: I am writing in support of the nomination of Nevada Attorney Miranda Du to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

I have known Ms. Du for quite some time. For the last eight years, I have had the opportunity to observe her legal skills and temperament primarily in my role as a member of the Board of Directors of the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (''TMWA''), which is partly owned by the City of Reno. Ms. Du has represented TMWA on several matters, and she has been both effective and professional in that representation. Ms. Du is intelligent, articulate and even-tempered. She is direct and always seems prepared in responding to questions from the TMWA Board. I believe she will be a great addition to our federal bench. I strongly recommend her for confirmation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CASHELL, Sr.,
Mayor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, continuing the time that has been allotted to me, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement appear as though in morning business, but I will utilize the time now allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I want to ask, Mr. President, if it is appropriate for me to speak on the judges who will be up for a vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, again, we are moving forward under the regular order and procedures of the Senate. This year, we have been in session for about 35 days, including today. During that time we will have confirmed 14 judges. That is an average of better than one confirmation for every 3 days. With the confirmations today, the Senate will have confirmed nearly 75 percent of President Obama's article III judicial nominations.

Despite the progress we are making, we still hear complaints about the judicial vacancy rate. We are filling those vacancies. But again, I would remind my colleagues that of the 81 current vacancies, 47 have no nominee. That is 58 percent of vacancies with no nominee.

So I am growing a bit weary of the vacancy rate being blamed on Senate Republicans.

I have spoken on numerous occasions about the seriousness with which I undertake the advice and consent function of the Senate, as I know we all do. Our inquiry of the qualifications of nominees must be more than intelligence, a pleasant personality, an inspirational life story, or a prestigious clerkship.

When I became ranking member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, I articulated my standards for judicial nominees. I want to ensure that the men and women who are appointed to a lifetime position in the Federal judiciary are qualified to serve. Factors I consider important include intellectual ability, respect for the Constitution, fidelity to the law, personal integrity, appropriate judicial temperament, and professional competence.

In applying these standards, I have demonstrated good faith in ensuring fair consideration of judicial nominees. I have worked with the majority to confirm consensus nominees.

In fact, of the 138 judges confirmed so far, I have voted in favor of over 90 percent of President Obama's judicial nominees. This includes supporting 100 of the 108 district judges we have confirmed during President Obama's term of office.

However, today on the agenda is a nominee that in my judgment does not measure up to the criteria I have outlined. Ms. Miranda Du was nominated to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada on August 2, 2011.

We have heard Ms. Du's life story—leaving Vietnam following the war; living in refugee camps with her family; coming to America at a young age; obtaining an education and establishing herself in a respectable career. She has risen above disadvantages that most of us can't imagine. This is a great success story, and we congratulate her for these notable accomplishments.

However, this is not sufficient for confirmation to a lifetime appointment as a Federal judge. We all can think of similar success stories. Miguel Estrada immigrated to America at a young age, graduated from Harvard, clerked at the Supreme Court, and had a prestigious legal career. His confirmation to the Federal court was defeated by a Democratic filibuster.

Justice Thomas grew up in humble circumstances, rose above his disadvantaged background to graduate from Yale Law School, faced discrimination in legal hiring, but went on to an illustrious public service career. He was barely confirmed to the Supreme Court.

Janice Rogers Brown, an African-American female, was the daughter of sharecroppers. Overcoming these circumstances, she graduated from UCLA School of Law working her own way through while being a single mother. She served in California State government and on the California Supreme Court. Her Federal judicial nomination faced a Democratic filibuster before she was finally confirmed by a vote of 56 to 43.

I bring up these examples to point out that many individuals we consider for judicial positions have overcome difficult circumstances in life. Most are examples of the American dream. Some are confirmed, others are not. But in each case, the gender or race of the individual, or the particular life story was not part of the consideration of whether or not to confirm to a lifetime appointment. So while I think Ms. Du's accomplishments are admirable, they are not the basis for evaluating her qualifications to serve as a Federal district judge.

The relevant factors for me are her ability and professional competence. In those areas, she does not meet the standards I would consider necessary for a Federal judge.

I would note that the ABA has rated Ms. Du with a partial ''not qualified'' rating. She states she was ''involved in'' four jury trials and has limited criminal law experience. As I have stated before, this is no place for on-the-job training.

A mere 16 legislative days after her nomination, Ms. Du appeared at her nominations hearing. At that hearing, she was asked about a case in which she was lead counsel. Ms. Du was the partner in charge of handling the case of Woods v. Truckee Meadows Water Authority.

In that case, she filed a motion to dismiss the original complaint. But she failed to raise the lack of subject matter jurisdiction as a reason to dismiss the case. The court, therefore, denied her motion. Ms. Du then filed a third-party complaint against the local union. But the union's counsel recognized that there was no subject matter jurisdiction. Therefore, they advised Ms. Du, in a six-page letter, that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The union, therefore, warned Ms. Du that they would seek sanctions if Ms. Du did not withdraw her complaint. Rather than recognizing her mistake and filing a second motion to dismiss, Ms. Du went forward with the third-party complaint. In response, the union proceeded exactly as they said they would: They filed a motion to dismiss and filed for sanctions.

The district court agreed there was no subject matter jurisdiction and dismissed the action. In addressing the sanctions issue, the court stated:

> Having reviewed the record and considered arguments of counsel at the hearing on this motion, the court finds that . . . TMWA's counsel acted recklessly. . . .

Let me remind you, TMWA's counsel was the nominee, Ms. Du. The court said she acted recklessly. The court went on to state that TMWA—referring to Ms. Du's client—''has not advanced a legitimate, good faith reason for bringing the Union into this litigation.'' Accordingly, the court concluded sanctions were warranted.

At her hearing, Senator LEE asked her if she agreed with the court's assessment that her conduct was reckless. She stated that she did not believe that she was reckless.

In written follow-up questions, I asked her again about the court finding her reckless, and she responded that she disagreed with the magistrate judge's finding. Let me be clear: The finding of reckless action on her part was not a mere observation of the court, but a legal finding. That finding allowed the court to award sanctions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1927.

I was troubled that she would fail to acknowledge the finding of the court that she was reckless. I think this demonstrates a lack of humility, which is an essential element of being a Federal judge. I understand attorneys may make mistakes or have differing views on litigation strategy. However, this is not the case in this situation. Ms. Du was put on notice of her flawed motion, was warned of the consequences of proceeding, but went forward anyway. That is why the court found her to be ''reckless.'' Her subsequent attempt to downplay this serious matter goes against the standards for judicial nominees which I previously discussed.

There is another substantive legal element that concerns me as well. That is her apparent lack of knowledge or disregard for the law regarding subject matter jurisdiction. Senator LEE's questions at the hearing on this issue I think demonstrate a lack of ability or professional competence.

Her written responses to questions for the record failed to adequately explain her legal reasoning or to clarify the issues raised at her hearing.

Accordingly, Senate Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously opposed reporting her nomination to the Senate.

I would note that more than 2 months after her hearing, and more than one month after she was listed on the Executive Calendar, Ms. Du sent a letter addressed to me and Senator LEE. In that letter, she apologized for her earlier unclear explanations and for her misstatements. While I appreciated her response to me, the doubts I have about her ability and competence remain. Therefore, I cannot support this nomination and urge a ''no'' vote on this nominee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know Senator INHOFE was on the floor, and if I could ask unanimous consent that after I speak, he would be next to speak, and then the good Senator, Mr. LEE, from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

It is my distinct privilege to come to the floor this afternoon to voice my full support for Susie Morgan's confirmation as an article III judge on the U.S. Eastern District Court of Louisiana.

I have known Susie for many years. She is a good friend and, more importantly, she is an excellent and outstanding attorney.

Ms. Morgan comes to this position equipped with decades of litigation experience in Federal court as an advocate for both plaintiffs and defendants. She brings a thorough understanding of Federal law and an unquestionably fair and evenhanded temperament.

It is unfortunate that such a talented individual such as Susie Morgan has been waiting nearly a year since President Obama nominated her in July of 2011, and almost 5 months since she was voted out of committee unanimously.

Despite what the good Senator from Iowa—my good friend and wonderful partner in so many important issues here—has said, the fact is there are 17 judicial nominees on this calendar. There are 19 judicial nominees in committee. The facts are that the nominees for President Obama have taken nearly five times longer to receive a vote on this floor.

We know there are some vacancies that have not yet received nominations. But there is no reason to deny these 17 who are still on the calendar their day on this floor. Ms. Morgan has waited more than her turn, and I apologize for that. She understands this has been caught up in bigger politics. It has nothing to do with her nomination specifically or her outstanding qualifications. But I do think we have to be honest about these delays and see what we can do to move people who are qualified, such as this nominee, so much more quickly because the courts need their help.

Ms. Morgan earned an advanced degree from the University of Louisiana at Monroe. She graduated from there, earning both her undergraduate and master's degrees. Then she earned a law degree on top of that, graduating in the top 5 percent of her class at Louisiana State University's Paul Hebert Law Center.

Immediately after earning her JD, Susie served as a law clerk for one of Louisiana's most respected legal minds, Judge Henry Politz of the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

At the conclusion of that Federal clerkship, she began practicing in Shreveport, LA, for one of our most respected firms, Wiener, Weiss & Madison.

For the next 25 years, she honed her skills. She was one of the most capable civil defense attorneys in both Federal and State court.

After years of successful practice in Shreveport, Susie was recruited by one of the most prestigious law firms in Louisiana, Phelps Dunbar, and has since served as a partner for the firm where she specializes in commercial litigation.

She served in a variety of posts, as many of our wonderful nominees have—serving without much fanfare but with great impact on many committees of the Louisiana bar, the Federal bar, et cetera. One of the most important that I want to mention here is that for 14 years she chaired a rules committee. It is not the sexiest kind of committee, not something known to the public, but it is so important to the practice of law for the thousands of attorneys who practice in Louisiana. She spent years behind the scenes improving Louisiana's State court proceedings. For almost 14 years, as I said, she chaired the rules committee and Louisiana Bar Association. Thanks to her leadership, the Louisiana Supreme Court agreed to replace an old and antiquated system where each judicial district in Louisiana adhered to its own set of idiosyncratic set rules, and now we have a uniform set of rules for the entire State. I think that is a special tribute to her tenacity, to her willingness to serve and do the hard work behind the scenes without a lot of public credit.

I am also impressed with the legal protection services she has offered to the homeless at St. Joseph's, the Harry Thompson Center in New Orleans, and the multiple community works she has done pre- and post-Katrina in our community. She has had a career that has demonstrated her willingness to work hard and to stay at the job, get the job done, to be fair, curious, and respectful and, of course, she is most knowledgeable of the law, which she has so well served. I am so proud to support her nomination. I am proud that President Obama accepted my suggestion and nominated her. I am very pleased. She should receive a full and strong vote in the Senate. She has the support of myself and the other Senator, my partner from Louisiana, Senator VITTER. I am very pleased to speak on her behalf today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise to express serious concerns that I have with the nomination of Miranda Du to serve as a judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

In 2007, the very same court to which Ms. Du has been nominated imposed sanctions on Ms. Du for ''multiplying the proceedings . . . unreasonably and vexatiously.'' (28 U.S.C. section 1927.) The basis of this sanctions order was Ms. Du's prior refusal to dismiss a complaint she had filed on behalf of her client, even after the party her client was suing informed her—and she did not dispute—that the Federal District Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. In imposing these sanctions on Ms. Du, the district court stated that she ''acted recklessly in failing to consider seriously the basic issue of lack of subject matter jurisdiction when the [opposing party] brought it to [her] attention.''

Ms. Du's errors were egregious, particularly because they involved Federal subject matter jurisdiction—the very basis of the limited jurisdictional reach of the Federal court system for which she has been nominated to be a judge. Ms. Du has not provided a satisfactory explanation for her conduct, but instead has repeatedly attempted to minimize the significance of her errors.

When asked at her Judiciary Committee hearing why, in addition to dismissing her complaint against the third-party defendant, she did not have the case against her client dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, Ms. Du responded that she did ''not realize this was a matter [she] could raise,'' and that she in fact did raise subject matter jurisdiction but on other grounds ''that the district court disagreed with.'' However, as pointed out in a letter members of the Judiciary Committee sent to Ms. Du following her hearing, court filings show that she did not raise the issue of subject matter jurisdiction.

In response to that letter, Ms. Du stated that she ''misspoke'' at her Judiciary Committee hearing and that she in fact had not raised the basic issue of subject matter jurisdiction. Troublingly, Ms. Du's belated candor was marred by an additional misleading attempt to minimize these same errors.

In her letter, Ms. Du stated that the ''motion for sanctions was later dismissed as moot and no sanctions were ultimately imposed.'' By going out of her way to make this misrepresentation, Ms. Du attempted to suggest that her sanctions were somehow not upheld or not imposed. To the contrary, after the court was burdened with a number of additional filings and motions regarding how much Ms. Du should pay in sanctions for her reckless conduct, the parties settled the issue out of court. The only matter that was mooted was the dispute over how much Ms. Du should pay, not whether she should pay. It is misleading for Ms. Du to affirmatively assert to members of the Judiciary Committee that ''no sanctions were imposed'' when the district court found that her behavior was reckless and plainly required and imposed such sanctions.

In light of the gravity of Ms. Du's errors and the importance to our Federal judiciary of the issue of subject matter jurisdiction, as well as Ms. Du's repeated attempts to minimize her errors, I must express serious concerns with her nomination and encourage my colleagues to vote against her nomination.

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.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Miranda Du, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted: ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Akaka	Casey	Inouye
Alexander	Collins	Johnson (SD)
Baucus	Conrad	Kerry
Begich	Coons	Klobuchar
Bennet	Durbin	Kohl
Bingaman	Feinstein	Landrieu
Blumenthal	Franken	Lautenberg
Boxer	Gillibrand	Leahy
Brown (OH)	Graham	Levin
Cantwell	Hagan	Lieberman
Cardin	Harkin	Manchin
Carper	Heller	McCain
McCaskill	Pryor	Tester
Menendez	Reed	Udall (CO)
Merkley	Reid	Udall (NM)
Mikulski	Rockefeller	Warner
Murkowski	Sanders	Webb
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Nelson (NE)	Shaheen	Wyden
Nelson (FL)	Stabenow	

NAYS—39

Ayotte	DeMint	Moran
Barrasso	Enzi	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Sessions
Coats	Johanns	Shelby
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Snowe
Cochran	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Hatch	Kirk

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Susie Morgan, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana?

Mr. CONRAD. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted: ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Franken	Moran
Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Heller	Portman
Bingaman	Hoeven	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Reid
Boozman	Inouye	Risch
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sessions
Carper	Kohl	Shaheen
Casey	Kyl	Shelby
Chambliss	Landrieu	Snowe
Coats	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Coburn	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Levin	Thune
Collins	Lieberman	Toomey
Conrad	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Corker	McCain	Vitter
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Crapo	McConnell	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—1

DeMint

NOT VOTING—3

Hatch Kirk Lee

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, any related statements will be printed in the RECORD, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 30 minutes and following that the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UTILIZING U.S. RESOURCES

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, there have been a lot of comments made about energy, and I have to admit I come from an energy State. One-third of our economy is connected to energy in one way or another. I think the political games we are playing are just that.

I have a vision that I can see 50 years of prosperity for America on the basis of one thing; that is, actually using the wonderful resources that are in our country for our citizens and extend an opportunity for our kids, in spite of our budget deficits, in spite of our debt, that would enable them to have the same kind of opportunities we have had. The way we do that is to utilize the resources.

If we look around the world and we look at the most stable countries, we look at Canada, what is happening? Canada is living within their means. They have fairly low tax rates. They are utilizing their resources. They have trade surpluses.

If we look at Australia, they have a stable currency. Their currency has markedly appreciated compared to the dollar. The Canadian currency has markedly appreciated compared to the dollar. They are utilizing their resources to advance their country and their wealth and their opportunity. We hear all of these statements made by lots of people, but most of them are half truths. Let me explain what I mean.

There is nobody who disagrees that it is going to take us at least 25 to 30 years to wean ourselves from carbon fuels, if in fact we should do that. But let's say we should. What is the difference between burning a carbon atom that is coming from the Middle East or Venezuela versus a carbon atom that we produce here? We are going to do that. Right now 30 percent of our oil comes from either the Middle East or Venezuela, not necessarily areas of the world that are akin to being kind to us as a nation.

Here is the difference: If we burn our carbon atoms, we add between 2 million and 4 million jobs over the next 10 years. Maybe even more than that. If we burn our carbon atoms—which we are going to burn carbon for at least 25 years—we decrease our trade deficit by at least $200 billion a year. That is $200 billion of wealth that does not leave our Nation, and actually it is more than that because if we get $200 billion worth of American oil and American energy, that creates another $50 billion to $60 billion worth of economic multipliers.

We are the only Nation in the world where we have the natural resources to make ourselves energy independent, and yet our government will not allow us to have access to that energy. So my challenge to my colleagues, given the fact that we will burn carbon—we don't even have to have a discussion about global warming or climate change because even the best estimate is it is going to take us 25 years to 30 years to get off carbon. So during that 25 to 30 years, should we not utilize and should we not create a way in which we actually consume our own resources rather than send money and wealth out of this country to be able to utilize the resources of someone else?

I am for conservation. I am for increased mileage. I am for doing everything we can to wean ourselves from a dependency on a foreign source for our energy.

Other than our debt, the greatest risk this country faces is our dependency and reliance on somebody else for our energy needs. If we take our friends in Mexico and Canada and we take what we are producing, we are able to attain 70 percent. That is a tremendous change over the last few years, and that doesn't have anything to do with the present administration.

As a matter of fact, oil production, natural gas production, both onshore and offshore, is down in double digits under this administration. Permitting—not new lands that have been opened—existing lands that are open has dropped to 40 percent in terms of the permitting process. In our Nation we have over 1.2 trillion barrels of oil equivalent that we can access if, in fact, we would. That is more than any other nation in the world.

So what is it that the big political fight is about? Do we want to send wealth out of this country? Do we not want to take advantage of what is available to us simply because of our location as a nation that will actually create tremendous opportunities for our children, that will create a new vision of America that is energy independent as we transition off of carbon-based fuel?

Why would we not want to do that when there is no difference in burning an imported carbon atom versus burning a carbon atom produced here? The benefits are obvious.

We have a bill we are considering that, to me, is mindless. It is about the politics of division, and it is not about any truth. The fact is the major oil companies that reside in our country pay the highest tax rate of anybody in the world. They pay over 41.5 percent of every dollar of revenue they make straight to the Federal Government. There are not any other businesses that compare to that. Google doesn't compare to that; Facebook doesn't compare to that; Apple doesn't compare to it. They are all half that rate.

So we are already taxing the oil companies to the tune of almost $36 billion, which went to the Treasury from the major oil companies in this country. The bill we have on the floor will not improve the revenue $1, and that is a fact. There will not be an increase of $1 over a 10-year period that will come to the Federal Government if we pass this bill.

Why is that? Most people don't know but my background is as an accountant. That was my first training, my first field. Accelerated depreciation just delays the time at which the Federal Government gets the tax dollars it is going to collect. It doesn't change the total amount of tax dollars, it just delays it so we match revenues with expenses, which is one of the things you are trained to do in accounting and in business.

By the way, oil depletion allowance is not allowed for the large oil companies. It is not allowed for them. It has been gone for over 20 years. So we set up accelerated depreciation on what is called intangible drilling costs. It would not have any major effect on the big companies, but it will literally kill the smaller capitalized companies because their capital needs are recaptured over a long period of time if we eliminate intangible drilling costs. So what does that mean? That means we will have less exploration in our country. We will actually harm the exploration for the middle and small oil companies.

Some will say: Well, we don't want to do that for them. We don't want to affect the small oil companies. We just want to affect the big oil companies.

The big oil companies will pay no increase change in their net taxes over a period of 10 years. So the only thing we can actually claim with this bill is the time value of money over that period of time, and the time value of money right now is less than 2 percent a year.

So what are we talking about? We are talking about a political game, and we are not talking about energy security. We are not talking about creating 2 million to 4 million jobs. We are not talking about substance. We are talking about politics, and the shame is that nobody out there is talking about a vision where America doesn't send $200 billion of its wealth out of the country. There is no reason for us to do that, and we have had every excuse except a legitimate one for why we should not burn our own oil and our own natural gas liquids.

What we have seen in this country in the last 5 to 7 years on private lands—that doesn't have anything to do with the Federal Government—is a renaissance in energy independence, moving us from importing over 55 percent to 60 percent of our oil from both the Middle East and Venezuela to 30 percent. That is a big change. Why is it that North Dakota, Montana, Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, areas of Pennsylvania, and now West Virginia, are seeing declines in their unemployment rate? It is all because they are producing energy that we are going to burn no matter where it comes from, and we should be burning our own assets.

The other thing that we don't think about is the fact that these energy companies have made a marked difference in the cost of everyday goods for every American in this country. Go into the kitchen and look at all the products in the kitchen. Go into the bathroom and look at all the products in the bathroom. The fact is, natural gas at $2.13—1 million Btus today—has enabled us to now become competitive worldwide in fertilizer, polyethylene, all of the raw materials for packaging for synthetic goods from clothing to vinyls to housing materials.

What has happened is a renewal in manufacturing in this country on the basis of this large expansion of available natural gas. If we do that with oil as well, what we are going to do is set up our country to beat everybody in the world in terms of petrochemical byproducts. Why would we not want to do that? Why would we put anything as a roadblock to that?

We have heard all the debate. The best part I know that seems the oddest to me is to think that doing this is not going to have an impact on prices. We all talk about the fact that oil is a global commodity, and at the same time we are saying American speculation on oil is why the price is higher.

Well, there is not just American speculation on oil, we can trade all over the world today in the commodities. Why is there a $15 to $20 premium right now? Because of the situation in the Middle East with Iran. Would the prices come down if that political situation were gone? Yes. Would the prices come down if we eliminated every American's ability to speculate or hedge a bet against the price of oil? Absolutely not. Because the price of oil is set on the world market, not on the American market, and it is traded by everybody around the world.

So the best way to lower the price of oil is to solve the problems in the Middle East but produce more. Prices go down when production goes up.

So the fact is, we have an administration that has taken credit for something they obviously are not responsible for, which is exploration on private lands, and has denied the fact that they have limited the ability of those people who actually have leases but no permits on public lands to explore for oil.

One of the answers we hear from the Secretary of the Interior is, nobody wants to permit new natural gas. No, they don't, not at $2.13. But they all want to permit in the areas where there is oil or natural gas liquids except the permitting has been slowed down. The new plan is to cut the permits in half on lands that have already been opened for exploration.

I would invite all of the critics to come to Oklahoma to see where we drilled for oil. More oil rigs are run in this country by Oklahoma companies than anybody else in the country combined. They do it well. They do it in an environmentally sound way. They do it with the smallest footprint we can imagine, and they are held to accountability by every corporation commission throughout the country.

I know in the Presiding Officer's State their corporation commission is right on top of it. We have 60 years of experience in Oklahoma with fracking. We have never had one contamination of any water zone in 60 years in the State—second to Texas and Louisiana—that has drilled more holes in the ground than any other State in the country. So what we hear is all the reasons why we shouldn't create an opportunity through our natural resources for our kids rather than why we should, and it is time we should.

There is one other thing affecting the price of oil that people don't talk about very often, and that happens to be the value of the dollar. When the dollar declines in value, when we have deficit spending and big debt, the price of oil goes up. Why is that? Because the price of oil is traded in dollars. So when the world sees us not addressing our deficit issue, our debt issue, the value of the dollar declines. Ten years ago the value of the euro versus the dollar was 96 cents. It is $1.32 today. So we can buy only two-thirds as much as we could 10 years ago in terms of products from Europe. That has an impact on the price of oil. If the dollar were strong, if we managed our budget well, if we didn't have deficits, oil would go down.

So the next time we are angry about paying $4-plus for a gallon of gas, the only place we have to look is the U.S. Congress because if we weren't running deficits, if we were making the tough decisions, the value of the dollar would be much stronger, the purchasing power of that dollar would be stronger, and the value of oil would be less. People don't talk about that. They just assume it is just the world market. It is not. It is that what we do here matters. The fact is, we don't address in any significant way the problems in front of us from a fiscal standpoint, which has created a lack of confidence in the value of the dollar. It has declined; therefore, the price of oil has gone up.

So we have a way. This is one of the easy problems for America to solve. It is one of the ways to create a great opportunity for our kids and our grandkids; that is, utilizing the resources we have. We can do that in an environmentally clean way that will not change our goal to become clean in terms of our energy utilization.

As we look at it, we subsidize solar to the tune of $692 a megawatt hour. We subsidize—if we call it subsidization—natural gas at 64 cents per megawatt hour. Oil is at 69 cents, and coal is somewhere slightly above that. For wind, it is over $100 per megawatt hour. So the money we are paying in taxes we are sending out to inefficiently compete with what is known to be there because the technology isn't there yet. That is why it is going to take us 25 to 30 years to ever develop the technology to wean ourselves from carbon-based fuels.

One more thought. There is new technology in terms of thorium nuclear reactors. A lot of people are worried about nuclear reactors, and they are concerned. We are very safe in this country in terms of how we have operated them, and we have a very good Nuclear Regulatory Commission that oversees that. The new technology eliminates nuclear waste and eliminates any threat of a meltdown. So think about it. Here we have a new technology in nuclear that significantly eliminates 99 percent of the waste. There is absolutely no threat of a nuclear explosion or nuclear meltdown. How many dollars did the Department of Energy put into that research last year? Zero dollars.

We have the President talking about algae. ExxonMobil has already spent almost $1 billion on algae. Why should we take your taxpayer dollars to invest in something in which the biggest oil company in the world is already investing? Can we do it better? Probably not. Is more money the answer? No. Technology and scientific breakthrough is the answer, and that takes time.

As we hear the debate on raising the taxes on oil companies, just remember that we are not really going to raise any taxes because the amount of revenue that actually comes to the Federal Government isn't going to change. It sounds good. It is good for politics. It is good for the election cycle. It is good to make somebody angry about the price of oil. But the problem with the price of oil has nothing to do with that. It has to do with supply, it has to do with the decreased value of the dollar, and it has to do with factors that are outside the control of this country in terms of market price for oil based on significant geopolitical considerations. So I hope my colleagues will think a little bit longer term rather than the next election about our energy needs.

The one thing we have never done and the one thing I have already heard on the floor this week is that it will take us 10 years to become energy independent. I was in this body 7½ years ago. I heard the same thing: Had we started 7½ years ago, we wouldn't be importing one drop of oil from the Middle East today—not one—and the price of our gasoline wouldn't be above $4. So we can't use that as a reason not to do it. The fact is, we can do it better, we can do it smarter, we can markedly increase the revenues of the Federal Government by increased resource utilization, and we are going to be burning carbon for at least 25 more years. I want us to burn our carbon, not somebody else's carbon. With that comes the future for our children.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

ENERGY PRICES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, high energy prices are hurting individuals and families and businesses, particularly during these difficult economic times. While I support the measure before the Senate this week that would eliminate certain subsidies for the largest integrated oil companies and extend several clean energy tax incentives, the fact that we are not debating a bill to establish a long overdue national energy policy is a missed opportunity.

To better protect American consumers against fluctuating and escalating prices, we need a thoughtful and comprehensive energy policy for the 21st century that promotes greater efficiency, the development of viable alternative fuels, and the production of domestic energy sources, including oil and natural gas, wind, solar, biomass and others.

The rising costs of energy are burdensome to Maine families, truck drivers, farmers, fishermen, schools, small businesses, mills, and factories. Nearly 80 percent of the homes in our State rely on heating oil, leaving Maine families extremely vulnerable to rising crude oil prices. It is clear that we need a dramatic change in our energy policy to protect ourselves from rapid increases in oil prices without sacrificing our environment. We must rally around a national effort to achieve energy independence for our economic, environmental, and national security.

In the nearly 40 years since the 1973 oil embargo, numerous approaches aimed at lowering energy prices have been discussed, such as expediting the review of offshore drilling permits, opening new areas to oil and gas leasing, releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and promoting the development of domestic energy alternatives. The serious will to tackle a comprehensive policy, however, has been lacking.

If the United States is to become less susceptible to volatile global market situations that drive up the cost of heating and transportation fuel, we must decrease our dependence on foreign oil. To accomplish this goal, we must promote energy efficiency and develop viable and affordable domestic energy sources. I have worked to advance these goals by supporting legislation that would promote clean energy initiatives, such as accelerating research of plug-in hybrid technologies for heavy duty trucks, providing incentives for producing alternative fuels from biomass, improving the energy efficiency of cars and appliances, the deployment of deepwater offshore wind power, and expanding domestic production of oil and natural gas in areas approved for exploration.

We must seize every opportunity to use oil more efficiently. For example, the provisions I was able to include in the last Transportation Funding Bill to allow heavy trucks to use Maine's interstate highways instead of being forced on secondary roads and downtown streets will shorten travel distances significantly. The owner-operator of a logging business in Penobscot County told me this change will save him at least 118 gallons of fuel each week. At today's diesel prices, that's more than $500.

The current political turmoil in the Middle East and our reliance on oil from countries with which we have strained relations, such as Venezuela, remind us that decreasing our dependence on foreign oil and relying on domestic energy sources must be the cornerstone of our Nation's energy policy. For this reason, I have supported efforts to increase the responsible domestic production of oil and gas.

Our efforts to increase American production should first be focused on regions that are already open to gas and oil production. The many lessons learned from last year's oil spill disaster in the Gulf will help to ensure stricter safety regulations. I continue to believe, however, that we must also continue to avoid our most sensitive coastal areas and areas that are essential to our fishing industry, such as Georges Bank. Pursuing domestic oil and gas leasing and transport is an important component in reaching this goal, and I remain disappointed in the President's decision to deny the permit for the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. Canada is our Nation's largest trading partner, and construction of the pipeline would create thousands of jobs in our two nations and reduce our reliance on oil from overseas.

Finally, we must also continue to support important safety net programs, including providing adequate resources for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to help low-income Mainers and senior citizens afford to heat their home. The Weatherization Assistance Program, which helps Mainers improve the efficiency of their homes and substantially reduce heating bills for the long-term, is another very important program.

I remain committed to working with my Senate colleagues to advance effective and commonsense energy legislation that increases America's supply of energy and decreases our demand for foreign oil. This will help us to achieve energy independence and stabilize gas and oil prices.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is long past time to close the wasteful tax loopholes for Big Oil. Over the past 10 years, the five biggest private sector oil companies—BP, ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell, and ConocoPhillips—have amassed combined profits of almost $1 trillion. Last year was no different. Due to skyrocketing prices for oil, these same five corporations raked in a record-breaking $137 billion in profits. Despite this massive windfall, Big Oil continued to receive billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies subsidies that are unnecessary and, in my opinion, unconscionable. The Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act will eliminate these harmful subsidies and level the playing field for all Americans.

Big Oil does not need these big tax breaks, and the prices they set for consumers at the pump suggest that they don't appreciate them. As of March 22, the national average price of regular gasoline is over $3.88 per gallon—up almost $0.34 from a year ago. I need look no further than the prices at the pump in Vermont, where the average price for a gallon of gasoline is $3.85—up approximately $0.30 from the average price in March 2011. This price increase is especially burdensome in rural states such as Vermont, where people must often rely on cars to get around, and heating fuel is a life-or-death necessity in the winter. For every penny the price of gasoline increases, big oil companies make an additional $200 million per quarter.

In spite of their ever-increasing profits and unneeded subsidies, the five major oil companies have done absolutely nothing to bring down prices for average consumers. Instead, they have padded their own pockets, using the vast majority of their net profits to pay exorbitant dividends, repurchase stock, lobby government officials, and buy radio and newspaper advertising to fight this bill. These actions benefit elite oil company executives and the companies' largest stockholders but do nothing whatsoever to ease the pain of hardworking Americans who trying to commute to their jobs every day or heat their homes during the long winter months.

This bill will halt the transfer of money from hard-working middle class families to oil company fat cats by ending more than $2 billion in annual tax breaks. It is a watershed moment for both energy policy and deficit reduction, and I support it wholeheartedly. Eliminating these wasteful tax breaks that benefit a few undeserving companies will allow us to reinvest in clean energy technologies that will benefit everyone. These investments will improve our national security by making the U.S. less dependent on foreign oil. They will also strengthen our economy and create new green jobs for the large number of Americans who are currently out of work and facing hard times.

Specifically, the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act would renew incentives for clean energy technologies and put America on the path to energy independence. In order to break free from our unhealthy addiction to oil, we must choose the President's all-of-the-above energy strategy which will grow clean energy industries, including alternative fuel vehicles, advanced manufacturing, biofuels, and solar, to name just a few. Savings from repealing these tax subsidies for Big Oil will help continue important incentives for alternatives to oil and usher in a bright new future of energy independence.

In addition to the benefits we will receive from investing in clean energy technology, the remaining savings from this bill will be dedicated to reducing the national deficit, a goal shared by both Democrats and, supposedly, Republicans. Time and again we have heard seemingly impassioned rhetoric from Republicans about the need to balance the budget and rein in spending. And yet, when given the chance to end more than $2 billion per year in unnecessary tax breaks, Republicans have stood with Big Oil. Instead of standing with Big Oil, we need to stand up to Big Oil.

For years, Republicans have opposed efforts to end taxpayer subsidies to the major oil companies. However, lavishing these giant corporations with incentives they do not need merely deepens our deficit and takes money out of the pockets of hard-working families, money which could be spent growing the economy and hastening our recovery. The Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act is precisely the action we should take to ensure that oil companies pay their fair share to help lower the deficit, just as working class taxpayers do.

It is important to note that cutting these subsidies will not result in less oil production or an increase in prices. Expert analysis has revealed that it costs the big five oil companies only about $11.00 to produce a single barrel of oil. This amount is dwarfed by the current price of a barrel of oil, which has consistently hovered around $110 per barrel. At today's prices, oil companies regularly earn $100 in pure profit from each barrel of oil that they sell. In fact, the former chief executive officer of Shell Oil Company, John Hofmeister, has admitted that, in his point of view, high oil prices made subsidies unnecessary. Therefore, it is highly improbable that a small change in tax subsidies would reduce their output. Furthermore, because oil is a global commodity, any incremental change in production that might result from changing oil subsidies in the United States will likely have no impact on world oil prices and, therefore, no impact on the price of oil.

The Senate should also go one step further and once again pass the No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act (NOPEC), which I have filed as an amendment to today's bill, along with Senator KOHL and others. We must do everything we can to ensure that oil prices are not artificially inflated, driving up gas prices at the pump. Our NOPEC amendment will hold accountable those who engage in collusive behavior that artificially reduces supply and increases the price of fuel by allowing the Justice Department to crack down on illegal price manipulation by oil cartels. This illegal manipulation affects us all. As long as OPEC's actions remain sheltered from antitrust enforcement, OPEC's member-governments will continue to have the ability to wreak havoc on the American economy and their destructive power will remain unchecked.

The benefits of the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act should be obvious to all Senators. An overwhelming majority of the Americans, 66 percent, have said that repealing tax subsidies for Big Oil is an acceptable way to help reduce the deficit. I would go further. Not only is this an acceptable way to reduce the deficit, but in these lean times when so many are struggling to make ends meet, it is an essential way to bring the budget back in line. It is time to end Big Oil's free ride at the expense of taxpayers.

Going forward, our focus should be on 21st Century clean energy that powers a jobs boom and fuels our economy. If these tax breaks were ever justified, that day has long passed. The Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act will end the unjustified Federal subsidies for the biggest oil companies that are enjoying record profits at the expense of working families. It will propel us into the future by investing the savings in clean energy technologies and reducing the Federal deficit.

Senators must make a choice: stand with the American people and stand up to Big Oil or continue business as usual. I think the choice is clear, and strongly support this bill.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate this evening to urge Speaker BOEHNER and the House of Representatives to pass the bipartisan Senate highway jobs bill now. This is an important bill that would save or create nearly 3 million jobs with really a stroke of the President's pen.

From Washington in the Northwest, 33,700 jobs, to Rhode Island in the Northeast, 9,000 jobs in our small State, to Florida in the South, 81,700 jobs, this is the jobs bill on which we need to act.

Rhode Island would receive $227 million a year for highways, roads, and bridges from this bill, and that would hold us steady at funding this year's funding levels.

Rhode Island would also receive an additional $30.5 million each year for transit projects, which would be a 10-percent increase over this year's Federal aid.

Importantly, this bipartisan Senate bill that will be so good for jobs across this country includes language authorizing the Projects of National and Regional Significance Program. That will help fund critical infrastructure projects such as the Providence Viaduct. Where I–95, the main northeast highway corridor, comes through Rhode Island, it goes through our capital city, Providence, next to the Providence Place Mall, and it proceeds through Providence as a bridge. It is a big, long land bridge. Its condition is so poor that when you go underneath it, as you do to drive down and enter the back parking entrance of the mall, and you look up, you see that between the I-beams that support the highway have been laid planks. The planks are there to keep the highway that is falling in from landing on the cars that pass underneath the highway below.

If you look just to the side where Amtrak, the main rail corridor for the Northeast passes under the Viaduct, you see the same thing: Planks across the I-beams so the road that is falling in does not land on the trains as they pass or block the tracks.

It takes a program like the Projects of National and Regional Significance Program to address repairs of this magnitude, particularly in a small State like mine, which simply does not have the resources to repair a facility like that built in 1964.

The Senate bill would send significant funds to States to build badly needed projects like these. All of those projects not only repair crumbling, broken, and deteriorating infrastructure, but they put Americans back to work at a time when we still urgently need these jobs.

So we passed this bill in the Senate. We passed it with 74 votes, and another Senator making it 75, expressing that had he not been required to be at a funeral in his home State, he would have voted for it. So we have 75 votes on a bipartisan bill that spent, if I remember correctly, 5 weeks on the floor of this body getting amendments, bipartisan amendments, amendments of all kinds being worked on and improved to the point where it could pass out of this body with that kind of a majority—even in the contentious and partisan atmosphere that often prevails in Washington.

It is a good bill, it is a bipartisan bill, it is a highway bill, it is a jobs bill, and the House should move on it.

What have they done instead?

Well, the House Republicans initially proposed funding transportation programs with a 30-percent cut in existing transportation funding. That, obviously, would have been a disaster. It would have resulted in the loss of an estimated 600,000 jobs across the country. So, of course, it was overwhelmingly opposed by transportation advocates and by business groups.

The House Republicans then tried to introduce something called the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act back at the end of January. This bill was so extreme and so flawed that it was even opposed by many House Republicans. It removed dedicated funding for transit programs and went after things like offshore drilling.

Transportation Secretary LaHood was a Republican Member of the House of Representatives himself for many years. He said about that House bill that it was ''the worst transportation bill I have ever seen'' and that it would ''take us back to the horse and buggy era.''

So with bipartisan opposition to this extreme, the worst bill that Secretary LaHood had ever seen, Speaker BOEHNER was forced to pull it, and that was that for that effort.

Then they spent months going after budget proposals that would reduce spending on our highways and on our bridges. Ultimately, they have thrown in the towel. They have no transportation bill in the House. They cannot get one up for a vote. So they have fallen back on trying to pass short-term extensions.

Well, first of all, that is not a great outcome for jobs and for the economy. According to the Rhode Island Department of Transportation, short-term extensions have had significant detrimental effects. These include delaying $80 million worth of projects, which equates to the loss of 1,000 job-years of work; delaying planning for needed safety and structural improvements of a $300 million to $400 million interchange that is in deplorable condition; delaying the advertising and awarding of the entire 2012 formula-funded construction program, which may cause the State to miss an entire construction season, putting the entire road construction industry out of work for that season; making long-range planning and the development of a sound State Transportation Improvement Program nearly impossible; and, last, jeopardizing the State's plans to design and construct the replacement of the Providence Viaduct I spoke about.

So the idea that an extension just carries on the status quo, it is more or less OK, it will not create harm, and it will not cost jobs is just plain dead wrong. There is job loss and there is economic loss associated with these extensions.

So how have they done on the extensions? Well, they have not even managed to pull themselves together to deal with the extensions. The House leadership has proposed 60-day extensions and 90-day extensions to the Federal transportation programs. Twice they have placed these proposals over on their calendar, but both times they have had to pull the proposals down because they do not have the votes.

So what do they have over there? They have no bill they can vote for. The bill they did put up was called one of the worst and most extreme transportation bills in history by a former Republican Congressman. They cannot get their act together to pass an extension. Even assuming it is not a bad idea to pass an extension for our economy, they still cannot do it, even as bad of an idea as that is. So they have nothing, and we are coming up on a deadline. On March 31, the authority to draw funds from the Highway Trust Fund runs out. So we are up against a pretty serious time constraint. As we whittle away to those last days, and as they get ready to leave the House and head home without having done their work on transportation, it is becoming more and more urgent that they take some action. If they cannot do a bill of their own, if they cannot pass a 90-day extension, if they cannot pass a 60-day extension, there is one obvious solution that is standing there as big as the proverbial rhinoceros in the living room; that is, pass the Senate highway transportation bill.

It is right there. It is ready to go. It could be on the President's desk in just days. It is bipartisan, with 75 votes in the Senate. It preserves these important programs and saves or creates nearly 3 million jobs in this country. The people of America understand that our highways, our roads, and bridges are important. They want us to go forward on this bill. This is not controversial. This should be easy.

So the House needs to take a look at where they are and make a hard decision.

They should not go home without addressing this problem and let us hit the deadline wall—particularly not with a good, solid, bipartisan Senate highway bill waiting to be taken up, waiting to be voted on, and waiting to be signed. All of the indications are that if the Senate highway bill were taken up by the House, it would pass overwhelmingly. Who would vote against a bill that creates 2.9 million jobs? Who would vote against a bill that maintains our highways, our roads, and our bridges? Who doesn't get it that in this country, our highway, bridge, and road infrastructure is in terrible shape? We understand this. The Nation's civil engineers have given our infrastructure near-failing grades in these areas. Other countries spend 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 percent of their gross domestic product on infrastructure, keeping it right, knowing it helps grow their economy. We are down below that.

It is very unfortunate that the House at this point cannot sort itself out to come up with its own transportation bill, cannot sort itself out to pass an extension—they cannot even do that. A deadline is coming at them that is nonnegotiable. Ideology, partisanship, rhetoric—all of those things don't matter against the hard deadline they are driving this country toward. I hope and urge that they take up the Senate Transportation bill, put it to a vote, let's get going, let's put 2.9 million people to work rebuilding our roads and highways, and let's get America moving and working again.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BILL SWOPE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to commemorate my very dear friend, Mr. Bill Swope of Elizabethtown, KY, for his many successes in business and in life. Mr. Swope has made many contributions to philanthropy and his local community, and has affirmed a commitment to public service on behalf of the Commonwealth while setting an example for his family and others of what it means to be a distinguished citizen.

I have been very closely acquainted with Bill Swope, his brother Sam, and the rest of their family for quite some time. Bill was born in 1922 in Cleveland, Ohio. He graduated from Miami University in Oxford, OH, with a degree in business administration. Bill served in the U.S. Army during World War II as a sergeant specializing in artillery. He recently received the French Legion of Honor in 2009, and is now considered a knight of the French Republic.

His wife Betty was a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy WAVES before she married Bill on July 26, 1945. According to Bill, the couple's long-lasting relationship is because Bill has always remembered who holds the higher rank—and it isn't him.

The first business venture of Mr. Swope was established in 1952 in Winchester, KY; it was called Swope Motor Company Plymouth-Dodge. There were many doubts about the future of the young company in its beginnings, but the Swope family business survived and thrives. This year marks the 60th year of the family business. Bill is now retired has left the running of the business to his three sons Carl, Bob, and Dick.

The first generation of Swopes laid the foundation of the business. The second generation is now in charge and makes sure the business runs smoothly. One thing both generations can agree on is that the company needs to remain a local, family-run enterprise. Bill is excited about the next 60 years in the automotive industry, and he is the first to tell you how proud he is of the three generations of Swopes' leadership.

Mr. Swope has been involved in a tremendous amount of volunteer activities, charities, and leadership roles throughout the years. He has been an active member of the Lion's Club since 1952, a deacon, elder and trustee of First Presbyterian Church in Elizabethtown, KY, and the past president of the Fort Knox Chapter, Association of the United States Army in Fort Knox, KY. As a former member of the Elizabethtown City Council, he holds his community very dear to his heart. He has made sure to give back to the place he calls home in just about every way possible.

If you ever have the chance to sit down and talk with Bill Swope, you would quickly learn his passion for cars. Starting a company that has sold over 500,000 automobiles is just the beginning of his immersion in the industry. Bill likes to collect and restore antique and classic cars. Over the years he has become so good at this that in 1999, he opened Swope's Cars of Yesteryear Museum in Elizabethtown, KY. The museum is open Monday through Saturday, and admission is free. The attraction houses every type of classic car you could imagine, and people from around the world have made a trip to the Commonwealth just to take a look.

Bill is very proud of his accomplishments in the business world, not because of the success he himself acquired, but for the opportunities he has helped to provide for so many other Kentuckians. Bill is a sensitive and thoughtful individual, and a natural-born leader. And he is first and foremost a loyal family man, a husband, father, foster-father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

Bill is a joy to be around, he has a great sense of humor, and he always knows how to make you smile. He is an instrumental part of the economy of Hardin County, he is a vital part of the success of the State of Kentucky, and I am proud to say he is my good friend. I extend to him my heartiest congratulations on his lifetime of accomplishments, and I look forward to his future endeavors, wherever they may lie.

I would like to ask my U.S. Senate colleagues to join me in paying tribute to all Bill Swope has achieved for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

An article was recently published in Hardin County's local newspaper, the News-Enterprise, which highlights the life of Mr. Bill Swope, and also follows Bill as he looks back on over 60 years of success in the private sector. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to appear in the RECORD as follows:

[From the News-Enterprise, Jan. 29, 2012]

SWOPES CELEBRATE 60 YEARS IN BUSINESS

(By Sarah Bennet)

Nearly 60 years ago in March of 1952, Swope Dodge-Plymouth was celebrating its grand opening at the corner of College and Mulberry streets. The dealership already had been open for a couple months, but people crammed into the one-car showroom for the event.

As Bill Swope remembers, two competitors, Buick and Pontiac dealers, were there that day and were overheard to make the following exchange: ''I'll give them six months,'' one dealer said about Bill Swope and his brother Sam.

The other replied, ''I think you're being pretty generous.''

This year marks 60 years in business for Elizabethtown's Swope Family of Dealerships and Louisville's Sam Swope Auto Group.

Combined, the two Swope businesses have sold more than 500,000 automobiles, Bill said.

''We're kind of proud of that,'' the 89-year-old said during a phone interview.

''We think the 60 years have given us pretty good practice, and we're pretty well set for the next 60 years,'' he said.

Today, Bill is retired and his sons are managing the family business. Bob, 64, is president of Bob Swope Ford, while Carl, 54, is president and CEO of Swope Family of Dealerships. Their brother, Dick, is CEO of Sam Swope Auto Group.

As the second generation closes out the family's first 60 years, Carl said the ''dynamic third generation'' is getting involved with the business, which will continue to be a local, family-owned company.

''As the successive generations get involved, there's more of them,'' Carl Swope said. ''There's certainly an increased capacity to do things. We're very excited about the next 60 years and think that the growth of the family business will be even more fantastic than what we've seen.''

''I think that's very important,'' Bill added about keeping the Swope Family of Dealerships both local and family-owned. ''We're very proud of our family. Our family seems to be well-adapted to the automobile industry. We're very proud of the products that we're selling and certainly of the people that we have, our associates, that help make our business successful.''

But as the Swope men point out, the 60 years in business hasn't been a cake walk. The automobile industry has had its ups and downs throughout the years, and in January 1966, the Swope's second location at the corner of St. John Road and U.S. 31W burned down.

The building was a total loss, and the Elizabethtown Swope dealership was without a home for nearly 12 months.

''We ran an ad in the paper at the time—a picture of the building totally destroyed,'' Bill said. ''Here it is, winter time. I'm standing in the rubble of the building and there's still smoke billowing up from the ashes. We ran a full-page ad and the headline of that ad was, Low overhead? We have no overhead.'''

But, somehow, with help from some competitors and their hard-working employees, the Swope family stayed in business, he said, and they began building where the Swope Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep-Ram building is today.

''January to December 1966, we were kind of operating out of the backseat of our cars and out of briefcases and various stalls that were loaned to our technicians,'' Bill said. ''We moved out to what was then out in the country, and we dubbed that part of Dixie 'The Miracle Mile.' It wasn't much of a miracle at the time, but we thought it would be. Certainly it has turned out that way.''

Asked about the recent downturn in the automobile industry, the Swopes stay optimistic.

Americans love their automobiles and will always need a way to travel from Point A to Point B, they say. That fact always will remain true regardless of how cars evolve in the future.

''Over that 60 years, we've seen a number of ups and downs in our industry,'' Bob Swope said, ''and we certainly learned to make adjustments that were necessary for getting through those slow periods. It seems like each time we've experienced slow periods, the industry then comes back very robust.''

The recent downturn was difficult for the entire industry, Carl said, but the Swope family made it through without making any layoffs.

''I would give a lot of credit to our associates for how they responded to (the downturn),'' he said. ''Our people rose to the occasion. They became more efficient and effective in what they do.''

Bob said over the years the Swope Family of Dealerships has developed a culture in its stores that values its associates and makes them part of the family, a business practice that has contributed to the company's longevity.

''One of the things that we learned very early on was to make sure our associates were also very happy with their working experience,'' he said. ''So we work very hard to try to make sure that they feel like they're just an extended part of the family.''

In 2011, the Swopes were up 20 percent compared to the previous year, Carl said, partially because of activity at Fort Knox. The Hardin County locations sold 4,538 retail vehicles, which was ''a pretty steady mix'' of both used and new cars.

Combined, the Elizabethtown and Louisville locations sold more than 22,000 vehicles in 2011, he said.

As they celebrate 60 years in business, the Swope family is expanding. Later this year, the business will hold grand openings for a new Nissan dealership as well as the expansion of its museum, which is one of Bill's projects.

Bill referred to it as a tribute to the Hardin County community and the customers who have supported the Swope family over the years. Open each Monday through Saturday, admission is free.

Reminiscing about the early years in the business, Bill recalled one of the first business deals he and Sam made in January 1952, not long after they opened the Swope Dodge-Plymouth doors for the first time. An Elizabethtown cab company, Dixie Cab, wanted to increase its fleet.

''So one of the first orders we got was a big order,'' he said. ''They increased their fleet from two cabs to three, which is 50 percent. That was one of our first sales, and it was a Plymouth Cranbrook for Dixie Cab.''

Bill recently located a 1952 Plymouth Cranbrook with some 15,000 miles on it which he plans to detail.

''You don't see many of those anymore,'' he said. ''You will see that car parked out in front of the museum when it is completed.''

TRIBUTE TO FRANCE CÓRDOVA

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dr. France A. Córdova, Purdue University's 11th president and the first woman to head that institution.

Dr. Córdova became president of Purdue on July 16, 2007, and has overseen a strategic plan that emphasizes student success, research deliverables and global engagement. During her presidency, she has led Purdue to record levels of research funding, reputational rankings, and student retention rates; championed diversity among students, staff and university leadership; and promoted student success, faculty excellence, education affordability and programmatic innovation. Under her leadership, Purdue has expanded its role as a top research institution on the global stage and raised more than $1 billion through private philanthropy.

President Córdova will retire from Purdue at the end of her 5-year term, July 2012. She leaves a legacy of excellence at Purdue and in the field of higher education. Among the numerous national boards she serves, she is currently the chair of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, a three-year term which began in January 2012.

That Purdue is the cradle of astronauts—with 23 astronaut alumni—is significant to Dr. Córdova, who first dreamed of exploring space as she watched Neil Armstrong take the first human footsteps on the moon in 1969. She has served Purdue University honorably and with a great commitment to students, research innovation and global outreach.

It is my honor to recognize Dr. France A. Córdova as an outstanding scientist, educator and administrator, who has given so much to Purdue University and the State of Indiana, and I wish her every continuing success in her future endeavors.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today, the Supreme Court concluded three days of oral arguments about the affordable care act, the law Congress passed 2 years ago to provide millions of Americans with access to affordable health care while bringing the spiraling costs in this area under control.

I was fortunate to be able to attend yesterday's argument about the constitutionality of the provision requiring individuals to take personal responsibility for paying for their health care, and to watch in person and in real time. Hundreds of thousands of Vermonters and millions of Americans across the country who benefit from the affordable care act did not have that access. The Supreme Court's decision in this landmark case will affect every American. I think every American should have had a chance to see it and the Supreme Court should open its proceedings to television and radio.

Americans are already beginning to see some of the benefits of insurance reform. Seniors on Medicare who have high-cost prescriptions are starting to receive help when trapped within a coverage gap known as the ''doughnut hole.'' The affordable care act completely closes the coverage gap by 2020, and the new law makes it easier for seniors to afford prescription drugs in the meantime. In 2010, more than 7,000 Vermonters received a $250 rebate to help cover the cost of their prescription drugs when they hit the doughnut hole. Last year, nearly 6,800 Vermonters with Medicare received a 50-percent discount on their covered brandname prescriptions, resulting in an average savings of $714 per person. Since the affordable care act was signed into law, more than 4,000 young adults in Vermont have gained health insurance coverage under these reforms, which allow young adults to stay on their parents' plans until their 26th birthdays. The improvements we are seeing in Vermont go on and on: 81,649 Vermonters on Medicare and more than 100,000 Vermonters with private insurance gained access to and received preventative screening coverage with no deductible or copay. These are just a few of the dozens of consumer protections included in the law that are benefiting Vermonters and all Americans every day.

Now that the law is in effect, many of the essential antidiscrimination and consumer protections of the affordable care act are being implemented, allowing consumers to take control of their own health care decisions. Going forward, insurance plans can no longer deny children coverage because of a preexisting health condition; insurance plans are barred from dropping beneficiaries from coverage simply because of an illness; dozens of preventative care services must be covered at no cost and with no copay; and Americans will have access to an easier appeals process for private medical claims that are denied.

I attended Tuesday's argument with Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. He and I disagreed about the affordable care act when we debated it extensively in the Senate and passed it 2 years ago. But we both respect the important role the Court plays in our constitutional system. I hope that as the Supreme Court considers its decision in the coming weeks, it respects the important role of Congress, the elected representatives of the American people.

For years, we have heard Republican and Democratic Senators rightfully say that judges should not make law from the bench. For the sake of the health and security of our nation, the Supreme Court should not cast aside this landmark law and Congress' time-honored ability to protect the American people.

After watching the arguments and following the debate closely, it is as clear to me now as it was when Congress debated and passed the law more than 2 years ago. The Supreme Court should uphold the affordable care act. Looking at Article I of the Constitution and a long line of Supreme Court precedents dating back to the Nation's earliest days, there is no question Congress acted well within its time-honored ability to protect the American people.

Every Member of Congress takes an oath of office to ''support and defend the Constitution of the United States.'' We take this oath seriously. As Justice Scalia said at a Judiciary Committee hearing last year, we take the same oath that the Justices take.

During the course of Congress' extensive consideration of the affordable care act, we considered untold numbers of amendments in committees and before the Senate. That is what Congress is supposed to do. We consider legislation, debate it, vote on it, and act in our best judgment to promote the general welfare. Some Senators agreed and some disagreed, but this was a matter decided by the democratically elected Congress.

Among the arguments expressly considered and rejected by Congress before passing the affordable care act were arguments that the law was not constitutional. We considered and rejected arguments that the part of the law now being challenged in the Court—the individual mandate—is not constitutional. In fact, those arguments were considered on the Senate floor when Senator HATCH raised and the Senate formally rejected a constitutional point of order claiming that the individual responsibility requirement was unconstitutional. During the Senate debate on the affordable care act, I responded, publicly and on the record, to arguments about the constitutionality of this requirement. No Justice could say Congress did not consider the constitutionality of the affordable care act.

The individual mandate is about personal responsibility. Throwing out this requirement that Americans be responsible for their necessary health care costs will result in tossing aside the provision that bans insurance companies from denying Americans coverage based on pre-existing conditions. The personal responsibility requirement is necessary to ensure that Americans who do have health insurance are not stuck with paying the $43 billion in health care costs incurred by millions of Americans who do not buy health insurance, instead relying on expensive emergency health care when inevitably faced with medical problems. Congress concluded this after extensive study and debate.

I joined with congressional leaders in filing an amicus brief defending the affordable care act in the case now being considered by the Court because I am convinced that Congress acted well within the limits of the Constitution in acting to secure affordable health care for all Americans. I believe we must defend the enumerated powers given to Congress by the Constitution so that our ability to help protect hardworking American workers, families and consumers is not wrongly curtailed by the courts.

Partisan opponents of the affordable care act want judges to override these legislative decisions properly made by Congress, the elected representatives of the American people. They want to challenge the wisdom understood by generations of Supreme Court justices from the great Chief Justice John Marshall in upholding the constitutionality of the national bank nearly 200 years ago to Justice Cardozo in finding Social Security constitutional early in the last century.

The difference between the role of Congress and of the courts is not a partisan one or a controversial one. In his opinion upholding the affordable care act, Jeffrey Sutton, a conservative, President George W. Bush's appointee to the Sixth Circuit, understood the importance of courts not substituting their policy preferences for those of Congress. He wrote: ''Time assuredly will bring to light the policy strengths and weaknesses of using the individual mandate as part of this national legislation, allowing the peoples' political representatives, rather than their judges, to have the primary say over its utility.''

Professor Charles Fried, who was Solicitor General under President Reagan, testified at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing a year ago on the constitutionality of the affordable care act. When Senator GRASSLEY asked him if there needs to be changes to the part of the law requiring that individuals purchase health insurance to make it constitutional, Professor Fried answered: ''I see no need for it because it seems so clearly constitutional.'' I agree with him and I do not think it is a close call.

The provisions of the affordable care act are firmly rooted in what previous Congresses enacted over the last century to protect hard-working Americans. Working Americans have long been required to pay for Social Security and Medicare by the deduction of taxes reflected on their paychecks every month. It is not novel for Congress to pass laws affecting a health care market that makes up one-sixth of the U.S. economy, the key to satisfying the test for constitutionality under the Commerce Clause.

What is telling about the partisan nature of these challenges is that many of those who now claim that the requirement that Americans have health insurance or face a tax penalty is unconstitutional are the very ones who proposed it. Republican Senators such as ORRIN HATCH, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and JOHN MCCAIN proposed and supported a health insurance requirement when President Clinton was trying to increase access to health care. They proposed the individual mandate as an alternative when they opposed President Clinton's plan. This requirement was also a part of health care reform in Massachusetts supported by former Governor Mitt Romney and by SCOTT BROWN, now a Republican Senator from Massachusetts.

All of these opponents were for ensuring personal responsibility with an individual mandate until President Obama was for it, and now they are against it. Their views may have changed, but the Constitution has not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a March 24 column in The Washington Post by Ezra Klein, ''Why Ryancare and Obamacare look so similar,'' questioning Republican opposition to the individual mandate they once championed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. When I hear partisan critics attacking the affordable care act, I wonder what law they are looking at. The affordable care act will protect some of our most vulnerable citizens. The law eliminates discriminatory practices by health insurers, ensuring that a patient's gender is no longer a pre-existing condition, reduces the cost of prescription drugs for our Nation's senior citizens, and helps parents continue to cover their kids on their health insurance until they are 26. The law also provides necessary resources to help law enforcement recover millions of taxpayer dollars lost to fraud and abuse in the health care system.

If the Supreme Court overturns the affordable care act now, it will be devastating to kids, families, and senior citizens. I hope the Court does not undo the progress we have made. Doing so depends on legal theories so extreme they would turn back the clock even farther to the hardships of the Great Depression and strike down principles that have helped us build the social safety net over the last century with Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

The affordable care act builds on some of the cornerstones of American economic security built over the last century. I believed when it passed, and still believe today, that Congress acted within its constitutional authority to enact laws to help protect all Americans, I hope the Court does not overstep the judiciary's role by substituting its own policy preferences and denying a century of progress.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 2012]

WHY RYANCARE AND OBAMACARE LOOK SO SIMILAR

(By Ezra Klein)

Let's play a game. I'll describe a health-care bill to you. Then you tell me if I'm describing President Obama's Affordable Care Act or the budget released this week by Rep. Paul Ryan (R–Wis.).

The bill works like this: The federal government subsidizes Americans to participate in health insurance markets known as ''exchanges.'' Inside these exchanges, insurers can't discriminate based on pre-existing conditions. Individuals can choose to go without insurance, but if they do so, they pay a penalty. To keep premium costs down, the government ties the size of the subsidy to the second-least-expensive plan in the market—a process known as ''competitive bidding,'' which encourages consumers to choose cheaper plans.

This is, of course, a trick question. That paragraph describes both the Affordable Care Act and Ryan's proposed Medicare reforms. The insurance markets in both plans are essentially identical. And for good reason.

The Affordable Care Act was based on two decades of Republican thinking about health care. The basic structure was first proposed by the conservative Heritage Foundation in 1989, first written into a bill by Senate Republicans in 1993, and first passed into law by a Republican governor by the name of Mitt Romney in 2005.

About 2008, Democrats decided they could live with a system based on private health insurers, federal subsidies and an individual mandate as long as it produced universal coverage. A year later, Republicans decided they couldn't live with such a system, at least not if a Democratic president was proposing it.

The problem for the Republicans, however, is that they don't have a better—or even alternative—idea. Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, ''repeal and replace'' has been a reliable applause line at tea party rallies and an oft-uttered incantation on the floor of the House of Representatives. But while Republicans have united around ''repeal'' of health-care reform, they haven't managed to come up with a policy for ''replace.''

Instead, they've opted to apply their old policy framework—the one the Democrats stole—to Medicare. That has left the two parties in a somewhat odd position: Democrats support the Republicans' old idea for the under-65 set but oppose it for the over-65 set. Republicans support the Democrats' new idea for the over-65 set but oppose it for the under-65 set.

This isn't quite as incoherent as it seems. Democrats say they would prefer Medicare-for-All for the under-65 set, but they'll take whatever steps toward universal health insurance they can get. Republicans say they would prefer a more free-market approach for the over-65 set but that a seniors' version of ''Obamacare'' is nevertheless a step in the right direction. For both parties, it's the direction of the policy, rather than the policy itself, that matters.

There's an added complication for Republicans. They have assumed huge savings from applying the exchange-and-subsidies model to Medicare. But they don't assume—in fact they vehemently deny—that those same savings would result from the identical policy mechanism in the Affordable Care Act. The Democrats haven't assumed significant savings from the exchange-and-subsidies model in either case.

If the concept works as well as Ryan says it will, then the Affordable Care Act will cost far, far less than is currently projected. There's no compelling reason to believe competitive bidding will cuts costs for seniors but fail among younger, healthier consumers who, if anything, are in a better position to change plans every few years and therefore pressure insurers to cut costs.

The discrepancy highlights another difference between Republicans and Democrats right now. Republicans have put all their eggs in the competitive-bidding basket. If that doesn't work to control costs—and versions of it have failed in the past—they're sunk.

Democrats, on the other hand, are promoting a slew of delivery-system reforms in the Affordable Care Act. They're hoping competitive bidding works, but they're also trying comparative-effectiveness review, pay-for-quality, accountable-care organizations, electronic health records, penalties for excessive readmissions and medical errors, and a host of other experiments to determine which treatments and processes actually work and how to reward the doctors and hospitals that adopt them.

It's unlikely that the model in the Republican budget will prove sustainable. That legislation would repeal the Affordable Care Act, cut Medicaid by a third and adopt competitive bidding for Medicare. The likely result? The nation's uninsured population would soar. In the long run, and quite possibly in the short run, that will increase the pressure for a universal system. Because Republicans don't really have an idea for creating one, Democrats will step into the void.

As a result, Republicans' long-term interests are probably best served by Democratic success. If the Affordable Care Act is repealed by the next president or rejected by the Supreme Court, Democrats will probably retrench, pursuing a strategy to expand Medicare and Medicaid on the way toward a single-payer system. That approach has, for them, two advantages that will loom quite large after the experience of the Affordable Care Act: It can be passed with 51 votes in the Senate through the budget reconciliation process, and it's indisputably constitutional.

Conversely, if the Affordable Care Act not only survives but also succeeds, then Republicans have a good chance of exporting its private-insurers-and-exchanges model to Medicare and Medicaid, which would entrench the private health-insurance system in America.

That's not the strategy Republicans are pursuing. Instead, they're stuck fighting a war against a plan that they helped to conceive and, on a philosophical level, still believe in. No one has been more confounded by this turn of events than Alice Rivlin, the former White House budget director who supports the Affordable Care Act and helped Ryan design an early version of his Medicare premium-support proposal.

''I could never understand why Ryan didn't support the exchanges in the Affordable Care Act,'' Rivlin says. ''In fact, I think he does, and he just doesn't want to say so.''

GOVERNMENT INTRUSION

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, last Friday was the second anniversary of the new health care law. This week we have been reminding the American public to take a hard look at what is in it, and, more importantly, why I don't want to observe this anniversary again.

Examples such as the Medicare reimbursement formula that allows Massachusetts to set Statewide hospital reimbursement rates for providers equal to the cushy wages paid to providers at a 15-bed hospital on the island of Nantucket that caters to the East coast elite.

This robs 19 other States of money for their reimbursements because it all comes from the same pot. In short, there aren't enough clams at this bake to go around, certainly not to Kansas after Massachusetts is finished.

Or the Health and Human Services' rule that required qualified health plans to offer contraception benefits. As my colleagues know, religious institutions that hold moral objections to specific services expressed widespread concern with the rule.

In response, Senator BLUNT offered, and I cosponsored, S. 1467, the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act. This act would allow a health plan to decline coverage of specific items and services that are contrary to the religious beliefs of the sponsor, issuer, or other entity offering the plan without penalty and remain in compliance with the requirements under the new Health Care Law.

And what about the regulations that have caused insurance plans in 39 States to stop offering child-only plans, and parents in at least 17 States that are no longer able to purchase ANY child-only plans? Keep in mind, there are no private insurance alternatives for these families until the new health care law is fully implemented in 2014.

There is also the prohibition on what can be reimbursed from a Health Savings Account or HSA. I joined Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS in introducing a bipartisan bill to repeal this provision to restore the choice and flexibility people had in managing their health care expenses by buying over-the-counter medications.

Even more alarming is the act of granting waivers to more than 1,700 labor unions and others from participating in the new law. At issue are the mandates involving annual coverage forcing many employers not to offer coverage at all. So instead labor unions and others are getting waivers. Where is your waiver? Why can't all Kansans get a waiver??

At the time, Speaker PELOSI famously said we had to pass the bill to find out what is in it. Well, we have read it, and my concerns which I voiced throughout the very limited debate remain the same: the health care reform law is bad for Americans.

The health care reform law. Regulates every Americans' health coverage, by penalizing anyone without a Government-approved health plan.

The law penalizes American businesses that do not provide Government-approved health plans.

It forces more Americans into Medicaid—a broken, bankrupt Government entitlement program.

It puts the Federal Government in charge of your health insurance.

By one count, the law creates over 159 new boards, offices, and panels in the Federal Government to make decisions about your health care.

The law gives the Obama administration Secretary of Health and Human Services more than 1,700 new or expanded powers—to exert control over the lives and personal health care decisions of Americans; creates an unworkable new long-term insurance program that will go broke, leading to skyrocketing premiums or a taxpayer bailout; levies more than $550 billion dollars of taxes, fees, and penalties related to health care on American families and employers; and spends tens of billions of taxpayer dollars just to implement the massive new law.

The law micromanages how patients can spend their own tax-free health care dollars.

As of March 12, 2012, the total number of pages of regulations the administration has released related to the health spending law is 12,307, which is an increase of over 4,700 pages in the last year.

In addition to the formal regulations, the administration is also issuing hundreds of pages of subregulatory guidance in the form of ''bulletins'' to avoid having to describe how much these regulations will cost.

A significant portion of the regulations issued thus far have been interim final rules, which give the regulations the force of law prior to any public comment.

I have listed a number of these regulations in a letter I sent to President Obama. I did get a reply from Secretary Sebelius a few months later, but it never did address the concerns I had tried to bring to their attention. She did, however, note that they listen to all stakeholders before implementing new rules. Unfortunately, that isn't what I've been hearing.

While I travel around Kansas I try to talk to as many of our Kansas patients, providers and advocates as possible. Without fail, regulations and their effect on our health care system, how they affect health care costs, and the result they have on job loss come up.

I held a stakeholder roundtable in Topeka to get feedback from patients and providers on their thoughts related to health care reform. I was not surprised to hear that every representative at that meeting had a concern with regulations, but the sheer volume was truly extraordinary.

I was surprised to hear every representative at this stakeholder meeting discuss the impacts of health care reform and, more importantly, their concerns with regulations, some of which are buried in the volumes of regulations being put out every day and many that defy comprehension.

When discussing the health care reform and regulations with my constituents and those representing the patient and provider community, the No. 1 concern that I heard was a fear of what else is coming down the road? What will the impact of future regulations be?

The current burden of regulations pales in comparison to the uncertainty of future regulations. Future regulations from implementing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, PPACA, will have an even greater impact on jobs and the economy. This is like the second health care reform earthquake. If you are a health care provider, hang on.

Additionally, the combination of the regulations being issued to implement the PPACA statute has resulted in an increase in premiums for individuals and businesses, which, as you know, results in increased costs and tough choices.

Providers feel that the significant costs associated with implementing the health reform law are either inaccurate or not taken into consideration. In fact, I often hear that patients and providers feel that they do not have a voice in the regulatory process.

More specifically, a number of regulations are currently being issued through a shortened process. This shortened process allows limited or no input from those most affected by the regulations, prior to their implementation, and result in an even greater confusion. And from confusion we get higher costs.

It is my understanding that 20 of the 51 rules issued to implement the health reform law have been issued as interim final rules and therefore with limited input. While there may have been instances in which a shortened process was necessary or appropriate, this lengthy list is absurd.

In my letter to the President, I listed some 34 regulations that my Kansas constituents noted had the most significant impact. I encouraged the administration to limit the use of this regulatory process and take every available opportunity to get feedback from those who would be most affected by these regulations and allow for ample time to review and consider that feedback prior to implementing future regulatory priorities.

Time and time again, I have heard no more regulations will be issued in the shortened process, and yet the interim rules continued to be issued. I have heard that stakeholder comments will be thoroughly reviewed and considered, but the actions by the administration don't seem to prove this. I have heard that economic impacts will be carefully considered, and yet the studies indicate otherwise.

If history truly does repeat itself, I don't have much hope of that.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues paying tribute to the senior Senator from Maryland, who recently became the longest-serving female Member of Congress in American history.

Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI and I were first elected to the Senate at the same time. Over the past 26 years she has been a colleague, a legislative partner, and a friend. Courageous, determined, and honorable are only a few of the words I use when describing Senator MIKULSKI.

Senator MIKULSKI has devoted her life to public service. She began her career as a social worker in Baltimore, where she worked with high-risk children and educated seniors about Medicare. In 1971, she transitioned into politics by attaining a seat on the Baltimore City Council. As a council member, she continued to advocate for those in need. In 1976, she was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where she became the first woman ever to sit on the influential Energy and Commerce Committee. As a member of the House, she worked on a variety of important legislation, including funding for shelters for battered spouses.

Issues concerning women have always been a passion of Senator MIKULSKI's. From sponsoring the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to being a leader in women's health issues, she has been a champion for women's rights.

Senator MIKULSKI was particularly helpful to me during the Grand Forks flooding in 1997. When our third largest city was devastated by flooding and fire, Senator MIKULSKI stood with Grand Forks residents every step of the way as we fought for Community Development Block Grant funding to recover and rebuild. Her support was critical. More recently, Senator MIKULSKI joined me in pushing for comparative effectiveness research as part of health reform, so that patients and doctors can have better information on which treatments and medical interventions are most effective and which amount to wasteful spending.

Senator MIKULSKI is a fierce advocate for her constituents—and for working men and women everywhere. She will never back down from a cause she believes in, and she has compiled an impressive record of results. I congratulate her on being the longest-serving female Member of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a true trailblazer, my colleague Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. Earlier this month, she crossed a major milestone by becoming the longest serving woman in Congress.

Before she set her sights on Congress, Senator MIKULSKI worked as a community activist, social worker, and a member of the Baltimore City Council. In 1977, she was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Maryland's Third Congressional District. At that time, she was one of only 21 women serving in Congress.

She never let any misguided stereotypes or long odds slow her down. Ten years later, she won her first race for the U.S. Senate and in the process became the first Democratic woman elected to this Chamber from the State of Maryland. She immediately lent her voice to issues like education, health care, and national service.

Along the way, she has given a voice not only to families and the middle class but also sent a powerful message to women all across this Nation. If there were ever any doubt, they now know for sure that they deserve a seat at the table in Congress. And her message is being heard. Since Senator MIKULSKI first was elected to the House of Representatives, the number of women serving in Congress today has increased to 92.

I have gotten to know BARBARA well, especially through our work on the Senate Appropriations Committee. I know she would rather we focus on her accomplishments regardless of her gender, but Senator MIKULSKI has blazed an important path. Along the way, she has never forgotten the value of hard work that was instilled in her from an early age. She has also built the kind of working relationships you need to get things done.

There is a reason the people of Maryland have sent BARBARA MIKULSKI back to the Congress time and again. She is telling their story and making sure that every voice has a chance to be heard. I want to congratulate her on this milestone. It is an important one for her and her family, and I believe it is symbolic of the gains we have seen our Nation make since she first was elected to Congress more than 35 years ago.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in 1977, Jimmy Carter became our Nation's President, Elvis Presley died, and ''Rocky'' won the Oscar as best picture.

It was also the year my colleague, BARBARA MIKULSKI, came to Congress. She has served since then, for 10 years in the House and since 1987 in the Senate, with exemplary dedication to our Nation and its working families. Those of us who have had the pleasure to serve with her in the Senate and all the citizens of Maryland who have elected her to represent them celebrate this moment, for Senator MIKULSKI has become the longest serving female Member of Congress in our Nation's history.

BARBARA MIKULSKI is the first female Democrat to have served in both the House and the Senate, as well as being the first Democratic woman to be elected to the Senate without succeeding a spouse or father. She is, among all of us, truly a path breaker.

When she entered the Senate, there was only one other female Member of this body. Today, there are 17. BARBARA MIKULSKI has served as an inspiration, a leader, and a mentor to generations of women seeking to secure their rightful place as members of our Nation's highest legislative bodies.

Throughout her time in both the House and the Senate, she has worked tirelessly on behalf of the elderly, veterans, the poor, hard-pressed families, and our Nation's children. Daughter of a grocer, her roots are in Baltimore. She may have come a long way to play her important role here in Washington, but what makes her such a vital voice in Congress is that she has never lost touch with the values and needs of the blue-collar neighborhood of Highlandtown where she grew up.

BARBARA MIKULSKI entered politics as an activist and a populist, and she has remained true to that initial motivation. BARBARA MIKULSKI genuinely cares about the people of our Nation about all the people, not just the wealthy or the famous or the influential.

She understands the difficulties faced by working families as their incomes have been stagnant, as unions have declined, as disparities in wealth and income have widened dramatically. She is passionately committed to the importance of education for our young people, just as she respects and fights for our nation's elderly and their security as they negotiate the later years of life.

We serve together on the HELP Committee, on which she has long been a leader. No one, no one, better exemplifies the values of caring for those who are all too easy to forget working families, the elderly, the poor, the children than BARBARA MIKULSKI. Having worked with them both, I know how completely she has taken on the mantle of her friend Ted Kennedy and kept our committee focused on those whose needs are greatest.

As we celebrate the inspiration BARBARA MIKULSKI has been for the women of the Senate, Maryland, and the country, let's not forget that she has also been an inspiration to all of us. She has shown us how to fight for the powerless and how to cast votes based on ethical values and a deep commitment to our fellow men and women, not based on political expediency.

For that leadership, both as a great female legislator and as an accomplished legislator with a lifelong commitment to improving the lives of all Americans, we honor her.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to my esteemed colleague, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI from the great State of Maryland. I am honored to recognize the historic achievements of my fellow Senator. On Saturday she became the longest-serving woman in congressional history after serving more than 35 years in both the House and Senate. Originally a social worker and community organizer in Baltimore, Senator MIKULSKI's congressional legacy began in 1976 when she was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. Ten years later with her election into the U.S. Senate she became the first female Senator from Maryland as well as the first woman to be elected to both the House and Senate. Senator MIKULSKI deserves great honor and reverence for her dedication to the people of Maryland, the United States, and to the institution of the Senate.

Three years ago I entered these chambers as a freshman from a faraway State. Senator MIKULSKI was already known as a legend, to me and so many of my constituents. Since then, she has been an inspiration—and, to no one's surprise, a straight shooter and passionate advocate of her issues. More than once, when I have not yet signed onto one of her bills—usually something near and dear to her, like child abuse prevention—she has cornered me. And in a tough stance, all 4 feet 5 inches of her, she'll tell me why it is my duty to sign the bill. She is always right, and I am happy to follow her lead on such issues.

Throughout her time in Congress Senator MIKULSKI has been a champion for civil rights, fighting to end discrimination of all kinds. As the chairwoman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions she has continually fought to end discrimination in the workplace. In 2011 she was a sponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which ensures equal pay, regardless of gender.

She has also defended our Nation's teachers and students by fighting for more affordable and accessible education and supporting the needs of rural school districts. Just this year she introduced legislation that would ensure veterans who receive educational assistance from the Department of Veterans Affairs also receive adequate counseling when considering their educational options.

Senator MIKULSKI's accomplishments are numerous and diverse, from the day-to-day needs of workers, business owners, and students to the strengthening of scientific innovation and research. Senator MIKULSKI deserves great honor and esteem for her dedication to fighting for the good of the people of Maryland and the Nation.

I am honored to serve alongside such a devoted advocate, and I look forward to her continued service in the U.S. Senate. She began her tenure in 1977 as one of 21 women serving in the House and today is one of 17 women in the Senate. She has helped paved the way for future generations. Yet she likely would not agree that women have come a long way over those years; instead she will say there is a long way to go.

Today I congratulate and pay homage to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. She is a friend, a mentor, and—so very often—the good conscience of the United States Senate.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in honor of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. I join my colleagues in recognizing her for becoming the longest serving female Member of Congress in our Nation's history.

I know Senator MIKULSKI is more interested in results than milestones, but this is an appropriate moment to congratulate her for all that she has accomplished. She is both a tenacious fighter and gracious colleague.

The true measure of a society is how we treat people in the dawn and twilight years of their lives. By that standard, Senator MIKULSKI's career has been extraordinary.

From the start of her career in public service as a Baltimore social worker helping at-risk kids and seniors to today, she has been a champion for children and the elderly. She has been a champion for education, research, and veterans, and she has been an unflinching champion for Maryland.

Senator MIKULSKI has also been a friend since my first days in the Senate. Early on she reached out to me to explain the appropriations process in the Senate. My father, who spent his entire career in the U.S. House of Representatives, was always suspicious of the Senate. So to a freshman Senator making the transition from the House, hers was a welcome and reassuring gesture, kind of like the folksy gesture of calling me ''cowboy,'' which always brings a smile to my face.

Senator MIKULSKI's style is a powerful counter to the old Washington joke that there are actually three political parties: Democrats, Republicans, and appropriators. She always values the input of other Senators and strives to balance the many competing priorities of all the Members of this body. For example, we have worked together on the Joint Polar Satellite System. This program is over budget and behind schedule, but it is also indispensible to public safety and our economy. As an appropriator, she has the unenviable challenge of striving to continually put this program on firm financial footing. In the process, she has repeatedly asked for my perspective and welcomed me into the process. This is above and beyond the call of duty but is so typical of BARBARA MIKULSKI.

Many have compared Senator MIKULSKI's streak to another famous Marylander's—Cal Ripken, Jr. I think Cal would agree with Barbara when she said, ''It's not only how long I serve, but how well I serve.''

She has undoubtedly served this institution, this country, and Maryland very well.

I commend Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for her 35 years of service in Congress and look forward to her future successes.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PORTLAND'S FIRST AME ZION CHURCH

• Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I congratulate the First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in Portland, OR, on its 150 years of devotion to God and the Portland community.

In 1862, the A.M.E. Zion Church convened as the first of its kind in Portland, just 3 years after Oregon became a State. First Church's humble beginnings started in the home of Mrs. Mary Carr on A Street, now Ankeny Street, under the leadership of Rev. J.O. Lodge. Since then, the congregation has grown substantially and has weathered four relocations. It now has settled at its current home on North Vancouver and North Skidmore Avenue.

First Church has impacted countless lives over the course of its 150 years. It has provided shelter and clothing for the homeless, food for the hungry, and scholarships to young students chasing their dreams to college. Today, they continue their good work keeping youth off the streets and reducing gang violence. The church is a strong, positive force in the Portland community.

To Pastor Robert Nelson Probasco, Sr., and the First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church of Portland: Thank you for your dedication, conviction, and faithful service to the people of Portland.•

ARGO MARKETING GROUP

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as the American economy becomes increasingly global, small businesses specializing in telecommunications and direct-response marketing provide essential services to businesses throughout the world. Today, I rise to commend and recognize Argo Marketing Group, located in Lewiston, ME, for being among the best in this expanding industry.

Jason Levesque founded Argo in 2003 to provide consulting and direct-response marketing services to companies in Maine and throughout the world. Since that time, this small firm has continued to expand despite the turbulent economy, adding numerous jobs throughout the State. In 2011, Argo Marketing moved from Auburn to Lewiston to allow for a company expansion, which included the doubling of employees from 25 to 51. Moreover, the firm recently added 25 additional employees in January of this year to its new location in Pittsfield. This remarkable expansion provides high-quality jobs for Mainers, which is especially vital after the closing of Global Contract Services in Pittsfield, leaving 65 employees without jobs.

With cutting-edge technology, Argo is a leader in call center service and support. The company prides itself on having the best integrated system in the industry that is customized to handle a vast array of clients. Moreover, Argo has always firmly believed that having dedicated professionals as part of the Argo family helps direct the path of any given project. There is a pervading philosophy in the telecommunications, marketing, and customer service industry that retaining a current customer is easier than finding a new one. Indeed, customer care is a top priority, especially for small businesses competing with larger companies with more resources and cheaper products. This quality investment in customer service has been a key component in Argo's success.

Further, Jason understands the importance of an engaged staff and giving back to the local community. He consistently works to increase company morale and provide an atmosphere where people enjoy coming into work every day with a positive attitude. As a dedicated part of the Lewistown-Auburn community, this company also donated to Sand Castle Pre-School in Lewistown which assists disadvantaged youths.

Small businesses drive the American economy by consistently creating jobs in the private sector while spurring investment in their local community. Argo's success and expansion is a glowing example of why these firms are so critical to America's economy. It is innovative entrepreneurs like Jason Levesque who are going to lead us out of our economic morass by creating jobs and opportunity all across our Nation. Despite these difficult economic times, he has clearly fostered a winning strategy, and I congratulate him and everyone at Argo Marketing for their dedication to excellence and for maintaining an impressive record of job creation in central Maine. I offer my best wishes for their future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were placed on the Executive Calendar under Privileged Nominations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:41 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3298. An act to establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3309. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3298. An act to establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3309. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2682. An act to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2779. An act to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

H.R. 4014. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to information provided to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate announced that on today, March 28, 2012, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2038. An act to prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from using nonpublic information derived from their official positions for personal benefit, and for other purposes.

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–5501. A communication from the Vice President of Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Amtrak's Executive Level 1 salary for 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5502. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648–XB014) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5503. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod for American Fisheries Act Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XB028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5504. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648–XB010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5505. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure" (RIN0648–XA989) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5506. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Sub-ACL (Annual Catch Limit) Harvested for Management Area 2" (RIN0648–XB001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5507. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Sub-ACL (Annual Catch Limit) Havested for Management Area 1B" (RIN0648–XA971) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5508. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustment to 2012 Annual Catch Limits" (RIN0648–BB50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5509. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries

Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 11; Correction'' (RIN0648–AX05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5510. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic'' (RIN0648–XB031) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5511. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Services Surveys: BE–150, Quarterly Survey of Cross-Border Credit, Debit, and Charge Card Transactions'' (RIN0691–AA79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5512. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System (TDRSS) Rates for Non-U.S. Government Customers'' (RIN2700–AD72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5513. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Claims for Patent and Copyright Infringement'' (RIN2700–AD63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5514. A communication from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: Export and Reexport License Requirements to Temporarily Control Items that Provide at Least a Significant Military or Intelligence Advantage to the United States or for Foreign Policy Reasons''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5515. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XB004) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 80. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 344. A resolution supporting the democratic aspirations of the Nicaraguan people and calling attention to the deterioration of constitutional order in Nicaragua.

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 356. A resolution expressing support for the people of Tibet.

S. Res. 391. A resolution condemning violence by the Government of Syria against journalists, and expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press in Syria.

S. Res. 395. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Chicago, Illinois from May 20 through 21, 2012.

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 397. A resolution promoting peace and stability in Sudan, and for other purposes.

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. THUNE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KYL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COBURN, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. COATS):

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2243. A bill to establish a program to provide incentive payments to participating Medicare beneficiaries who voluntarily establish and maintain better health; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2244. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist in the identification of unclaimed and abandoned human remains to determine if any such remains are eligible for burial in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KYL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2245. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2246. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to provide off-base transition training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2247. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to improve the functioning and transparency of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2248. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2249. A bill to provide for the reform of the Senior Executive Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. Res. 408. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. Res. 409. A resolution designating April 2012 as ''Financial Literacy Month''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 410. A resolution honoring the accomplishments and legacy of Cesar Estrada Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2248. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce S. 2248, a bill that would clarify the States' sole authority to regulate the process of hydraulic fracturing at the State level as opposed to the Federal level.

I am pleased to be joined by Senators MURKOWSKI, VITTER, SESSIONS, CORNYN, RISCH, HOEVEN, and LEE as cosponsors.

The reason for this bill is the State jurisdiction of a process called hydraulic fracturing, which has taken place since 1949. In 1949, the first hydraulic fracturing well took place in Duncan, OK. It is interesting that there has not been one documented case, in over a million wells using this process—in 60 years—of groundwater contamination.

As a matter of fact, numerous studies, including reports by the Groundwater Protection Council, the EPA, and recently the Energy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin, have found no evidence of hydraulic fracturing posing a risk to water wells or groundwater. A lot of people believe—and I am among them—that the reason to take it over at the Federal level is to do away with hydraulic fracturing. It is interesting that, recently, with some of the shale deposits and discoveries that have been made in the United States, we have been able to get in there, using this process, and come up with huge reserves and start producing these reserves.

In every case, without exception—in fact, I will go so far as to say you cannot get one cubic foot of natural gas out of a type formation without using hydraulic fracturing. The process is and will continue to be a safe process. Despite the evidence, in President Obama's recent campaign rhetoric, this administration continues to wage an all-out war on domestic oil and gas development. During the State of the Union Message—it was interesting because, apparently, now because of the high price of gas at the pump, the President is feeling political pressure, so he is coming out and saying: No, I am not against all fossil fuels, even though he has been for 4 years. And he started talking about clean, plentiful, cheap natural gas. I agreed with that; that is what it is. However, at the same time, if he could have that rhetoric and be able to make the case that the Federal Government needs to take over the process of hydraulic fracturing to be under his control and he can stop that process, he can cut off almost all production altogether.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service—and this is one that came out this month—since 2007, ''about 96 percent of the [oil production] increase took place on non-federal lands.''

A recent study also found that 93 percent of shale oil and gas wells are on private and State lands. The Department of Interior is in the process of issuing rules which will further discourage production on Federal lands and federally regulate disclosure of fracking fluids, well integrity, and waste water. According to Secretary of Interior Ken Salazar, these are rules which they hope will serve as a model for future regulation of State lands.

The Obama EPA alone is looking to regulate hydraulic fracturing through its offices of Water, Air, and Toxics.

What does this legislation do? It is simple. It makes clear that the States have the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on any land within their borders. This would include Federal lands within the borders of a State.

It also requires hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands to comply with the State laws of which the Federal lands are located.

Activities related to hydraulic fracturing are already regulated at the Federal level under a variety of environmental statutes, including portions of the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Clean Air Act.

States better understand their unique geologies and interests. I happen to be from Oklahoma, which is an oil State, and it varies from State to State. Louisiana deposits are found at a different level than ours in Oklahoma. Recently, people think of all these deposits being located in the West. However, the Marcellus discoveries that have been made are actually in New York State and Pennsylvania, so their local regulations are much more applicable than it would be if you did it at the Federal level.

I invite cosponsors. Here we are in the United States with more recoverable reserves in oil, gas, and coal than any other country in the world. We can be completely self-sufficient from the Mid Eastern oil if we get politics out of the way and use our own resources. We are the only country in the world that doesn't develop its own resources. This is the answer to the problem—the answer to the price of gas at the pump. It is one more option. We need to get out of the way of this process called hydraulic fracturing.

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. 2248

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 ''Fracturing Regulations are Effective in State Hands Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) hydraulic fracturing is a commercially viable practice that has been used in the United States for more than 60 years in more than 1,000,000 wells;

(2) the Ground Water Protection Council, a national association of State water regulators that is considered to be a leading groundwater protection organization in the United States, released a report entitled ''State Oil and Natural Gas Regulations Designed to Protect Water Resources'' and dated May 2009 finding that the ''current State regulation of oil and gas activities is environmentally proactive and preventive'';

(3) that report also concluded that ''[a]ll oil and gas producing States have regulations which are designed to provide protection for water resources'';

(4) a 2004 study by the Environmental Protection Agency, entitled ''Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs'', found no evidence of drinking water wells contaminated by fracture fluid from the fracked formation;

(5) a 2009 report by the Ground Water Protection Council, entitled ''State Oil and Natural Gas Regulations Designed to Protect Water Resources'', found a ''lack of evidence'' that hydraulic fracturing conducted in both deep and shallow formations presents a risk of endangerment to ground water;

(6) a January 2009 resolution by the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission stated ''The states, who regulate production, have comprehensive laws and regulations to ensure operations are safe and to protect drinking water. States have found no verified cases of groundwater contamination associated with hydraulic fracturing.'';

(7) on May 24, 2011, before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee of the House of Representatives, Lisa Jackson, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, testified that she was ''not aware of any proven case where the fracking process itself has affected water'';

(8) in 2011, Bureau of Land Management Director Bob Abbey stated, ''We have not seen evidence of any adverse effect as a result of the use of the chemicals that are part of that fracking technology.'';

(9)(A) activities relating to hydraulic fracturing (such as surface discharges, wastewater disposal, and air emissions) are already regulated at the Federal level under a variety of environmental statutes, including portions of—

(i) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(ii) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(iii) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); but

(B) Congress has continually elected not to include the hydraulic fracturing process in the underground injection control program under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(10) in 2011, the Secretary of the Interior announced the intention to promulgate new Federal regulations governing hydraulic fracturing on Federal land; and

(11) a February 2012 study by the Energy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin, entitled ''Fact-Based Regulation for Environmental Protection in Shale Gas Development'', found that ''[n]o evidence of chemicals from hydraulic fracturing fluid has been found in aquifers as a result of fracturing operations''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAND.

In this Act, the term ''Federal land'' means—

(1) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702));

(2) National Forest System land;

(3) land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

(4) land under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 4. STATE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State shall have the sole authority to promulgate or enforce any regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding the underground injection of fluids or propping agents pursuant to the hydraulic fracturing process, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land within the boundaries of the State.

(b) FEDERAL LAND.—The underground injection of fluids or propping agents pursuant to the hydraulic fracturing process, or any components of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on

Federal land shall be subject to the law of the State in which the land is located.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2249. A bill to provide for the reform of the Senior Executive Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Senior Executive Service Reform Act of 2012, a bill to strengthen the Federal Government's senior leadership corps.

In this time of fiscal constraint, agencies and Federal employees are being asked to do more with less, and they are rising to meet this challenge. Leading the way in efforts to cut costs without compromising agency missions are members of the Senior Executive Service, SES, who are responsible for driving management priorities and promoting efficiency within agencies and across the Government.

Each year, Presidential Rank Awards are given to outstanding Senior Executives in recognition of their innovation and management expertise that save taxpayers billions of dollars. This is no small feat in an era of shrinking budgets and limited resources. I am proud that such talented people have chosen to join the Federal Government, and believe that America has benefitted as a result of their commitment to public service.

Last year, I chaired a hearing entitled, ''Strengthening the Senior Executive Service: A Review of Challenges Facing the Government's Leadership Corps.'' Witnesses testified about shortcomings in Senior Executive Service candidate development, diversity, and training. Testimony also focused on disincentives for applying to the SES, including increased workload and responsibilities compared to General Schedule, GS, positions with little additional compensation and fewer workers' rights. This bill addresses many of the challenges my hearing brought to light.

A recent report from the Congressional Budget Office concluded that Federal employees with professional degrees are paid 23 percent less than their counterparts in the private sector. The Senior Executive Service is made up of these highly-educated professionals who often find themselves not only making less than those in the private sector, but also other Federal workers. In 2004, Congress enacted reforms linking SES pay to Congressional pay, which has not kept pace with the GS. As a result, the GS pay scale overlaps substantially with the lower end of the SES. This means that a Senior Executive may be paid less than employees he or she supervises. This bill would mitigate the overlap—often referred to as pay compression—by having Senior Executive pay more closely pace the pay of those they supervise.

Performance-based pay is an integral part of the Senior Executive Service. The legislation would strengthen SES performance management and further address disincentives for joining the SES by including performance awards as base pay for the purpose of retirement calculations. Additionally, it would increase transparency in SES performance ratings by requiring an explanation for why a rating is lowered from an initial recommendation. Quotas in performance pay adjustments also would be prohibited.

Restoration of career leadership and career development are important components of this legislation. A Senior Executive Service Resource Office would be established to collect data on the SES and oversee candidate development, management, and training.

Finally, the bill would encourage diversity in the SES by requiring agencies to include ethnic minorities, women, and those with disabilities as part of the SES hiring process whenever practicable. This language closely mirrors the Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act, which I introduced with Congressman Danny Davis of Illinois in the 110 and 111 Congresses.

The time has come to reframe the discussion surrounding our Nation's civil servants. We must invest in our Government's senior leaders and recognize the critical role they play in making our agencies and the Federal Government more efficient and effective.

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. 2249

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Senior Executive Service Reform Act of 2012''.

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

TITLE I—RESTORATION OF CAREER LEADERSHIP

SEC. 101. SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE AGENCY APPOINTMENTS.

Section 3134 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The total number of Senior Executive Service positions used to determine the 10-percent limitation under paragraph (1) for available positions for noncareer appointees shall be based on filled Senior Executive Service positions at the start of each fiscal year, not total authorized positions.'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''25 percent'' and inserting ''15 percent'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e)(1) The total number of Senior Executive Service positions used to determine the 15-percent limitation under subsection(d)(1) for available positions for noncareer appointees shall be based on filled Senior Executive Service positions at the start of each fiscal year, not total authorized positions.''.

SEC. 102. CAREER RESERVED POSITION DESIGNATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE OR MANAGEMENT POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 14 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1403. Career reserved position designation for certain administrative or management positions

''(a)(1) The head of each agency referred to under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 901(b) of title 31 shall establish a position which is, or is comparable to, an assistant secretary for administration or management.

''(2) Each agency assistant secretary for administration or management, or incumbent of a comparable position shall—

''(A) be appointed in accordance with the law, or if no law provides for that appointment, by the head of the agency;

''(B) be a member of the career Senior Executive Service;

''(C) be appointed or designated, as applicable, from among individuals who possess demonstrated ability in general management of, and knowledge of, and extensive practical experience in areas such as procurement, human capital, information technology, and related matters; and

''(D) perform such duties as the head of the agency shall prescribe.

''(b) If the individual serving in any position of assistant secretary or in any comparable position in an agency described under subsection (a) is not a career appointee as defined under section 3132(a)(4), the head of that agency shall appoint a career appointee to the position of the principal deputy to that assistant secretary or the officer in that comparable position.

''(c) The head of each agency shall appoint a career appointee to the positions which entail direct responsibility for agency-wide programs or functions in the following occupational disciplines:

''(1) Acquisition.
''(2) Information Technology.
''(3) Human Resources.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 14 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1402 the following:

''Sec. 1403. Career reserved position designation for certain administrative or management positions.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

TITLE II—SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE PAY AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 201. ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVES AND OTHER SENIOR EMPLOYEES AT THE FULLY SUCCESSFUL LEVEL OR HIGHER.

(a) PROHIBITION ON QUOTAS AND FORCED DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 4314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) Any determination under this section shall be made without the use of quotas or forced distribution of ratings.''.

(b) PAY FOR CERTAIN SENIOR-LEVEL POSITIONS.—Section 5376(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2)(A) Subject to paragraph (1), effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment takes effect under section 5303 in the rates of pay under the General Schedule, each rate of pay established under this section for positions within an agency shall be adjusted, in the case of an employee in such a position whose most recent performance appraisal rating is the equivalent of fully successful or higher, by the total average adjustment in rates of pay authorized by section 5303 and 5304.

''(B) Subject to paragraph (1), subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall not limit the authorization of an annual adjustment based on performance or contribution to agency mission that is greater than the amount provided for in this section.''.

(c) SETTING SENIOR EXECUTIVE PAY.—Section 5383 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c)(1) Effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment takes effect under section 5303 and 5304 in the rates of pay under the General Schedule, each rate of pay established under this section for positions within an agency shall be adjusted, in the case of an employee in such a position whose most recent performance appraisal rating is the equivalent of fully successful or higher, by the total average adjustment in rates of pay authorized by section 5303 and 5304.

''(2) Subject to paragraph (1) this subsection shall not limit the authorization of an annual adjustment based on performance or contribution to agency mission that is greater than the amount provided for in this section.

''(3) This subsection shall comply with any requirement established under section 5382.

''(4) Except as provided under paragraph (3), this subsection shall not limit the head of an agency from authorizing an annual adjustment that is greater than the amount provided for in this section.''.

(d) SETTING INDIVIDUAL SENIOR-LEVEL PAY.—Section 5383(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) In this paragraph the term 'covered appointee' means—

''(i) an appointee to a senior level position described under section 5376(a)(1) or (2); or

''(ii) an appointee to the FBI–DEA Senior Executive Service established under section 3151.

''(B) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to covered appointees—

''(i) by substituting 'covered appointee' for 'career appointee'; and

''(ii) by substituting 'a career position as a covered appointee' for 'a career reserved position in the Senior Executive Service'.''.

SEC. 202. INCLUSION OF EXECUTIVE PERFORMANCE AWARDS AND BONUSES IN BASIC PAY FOR RETIREMENT ANNUITIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF BASIC PAY.—Section 8331(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in the matter following subparagraph (H), by striking ''subparagraphs (B) through (H)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B) through (J)''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following:

''(I) with respect to a member of the Senior Executive Service, performance awards under section 5384; and

''(J) with respect to a senior executive as defined under section 3132(a)(3), a member of the FBI–DEA Senior Executive Service established under section 3151, and senior level positions compensated under section 5376—

''(i) agency awards under section 4503;

''(ii) performance awards under section 4505a;

''(iii) bonuses under section 5754; and

''(iv) bonuses under section 5753;''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section only apply to bonuses and awards granted to an employee after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS.

Section 5307(d)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and the Office of Management and Budget jointly'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''not to exceed 24 months'' and inserting ''of 36 months'';

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', with the concurrence of the Office of Management and Budget,''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(D)(i) The Office of Personnel Management may annually review the information provided by agencies under section 4314(c)(6) to determine whether the agency meets minimum certification requirements.

''(ii) At the discretion of the Office, the Office may review the certification of an agency and request the agency to submit information to support certification at any time during the certification period.

''(E)(i) An agency that has received certification from the Office of Personnel Management shall not make changes to that agency's performance appraisal system without approval from the Office of Personnel Management.

''(ii) The Office of Personnel Management shall review annual performance plans to ensure agency compliance and implementation.

''(F) The termination of certification during the certification period shall be preceded by—

''(i) notification from the Office of Personnel Management to an agency about what the agency is required to do to continue its certification; and

''(ii) a reasonable period of time following the notification referred to under clause (i) to take corrective action.''.

SEC. 204. TRANSPARENCY OF RATINGS FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS AND RATING REDUCTIONS OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES.

Section 4314(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(1)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) When recommending a lower rating than was assigned in the initial appraisal of a senior executive's performance, a written explanation providing reasons for the lower rating shall be provided to the senior executive by the board not later than the date the recommendation is made.'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''Not later than 30 days after an appraisal and rating is made for a senior executive, the agency shall provide the senior executive with notification of that appraisal and rating, including, as applicable, a written explanation of reasons why a lower rating is assigned than is recommended by the board.'' after the period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A)(i) Each agency, having 10 or more career appointees, shall annually publish on the agency website the overall number of ratings awarded to members of the Senior Executive Service at each performance rating level, including—

''(I) the average overall salary adjustment at each level;

''(II) the minimum and maximum adjustment at each level;

''(III) the percentage of senior executives at each rating level who received the minimum and maximum salary adjustment; and

''(IV) the number of senior executives who received performance awards under section 5384 and the average amount of those awards.

''(ii) Rating levels and salary adjustment information under clause (i) shall be provided separately for career and noncareer senior executives in agencies having 10 or more noncareer senior executives.

''(B) Each agency shall annually publish on the agency website an internal plan which describes a system for determining Senior Executive Service salary and bonus amounts.''.

SEC. 205. TRANSPARENCY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE RANKINGS AND PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 4315 as section 4316;

(2) in section 4312(c)(3), by striking ''4315'' and inserting ''4316''; and

(3) by inserting after section 4314 the following:

''§ 4315. Survey on the transparency of Senior Executive Service performance management and pay

''In consultation with the organization representing the largest number of senior executives, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall every 2 years conduct and publish the results of a survey of career appointees relating to—

''(1) the level of transparency and availability of agency performance appraisal systems and compensation policies to career appointees;

''(2) the use or perceived use of quotas or forced distribution in the application of the agency performance appraisal system;

''(3) any actual or perceived irregularities with the administration of the Senior Executive Service performance appraisal system; and

''(4) such other factors as the Merit Systems Protection Board shall determine are necessary and appropriate.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4315 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 4315. Survey on the transparency of Senior Executive Service performance management and pay.
"Sec. 4316. Regulations.".

SEC. 206. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS.—Section 203 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE CAREER DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 301. SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE RESOURCE OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(2) the term "Senior Executive Service" has the meaning given under section 2101a of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the terms "agency" and "career reserved position" have the meanings given under section 3132 of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) the term "SES Resource Office" means the Senior Executive Service Resource Office established under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish within the Office of Personnel Management an office to be known as the Senior Executive Service Resource Office.

(c) MISSION.—The mission of the SES Resource Office shall be to—

(1) improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity of the Senior Executive Service through policy formulation and oversight;

(2) advance the professionalism of the Senior Executive Service; and

(3) seek to achieve a Senior Executive Service reflective of the Nation's diversity.

(d) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The functions of the SES Resource Office are to—

(A) make recommendations to the Director with respect to regulations; and

(B) provide guidance to agencies, concerning the structure, management, and diverse composition of the Senior Executive Service.

(2) SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS.—In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the SES Resource Office shall—

(A) take such actions as the SES Resource Office considers necessary to manage and promote an efficient, elite, and diverse corps of senior executives by providing oversight of the onboarding, performance, structure, composition, and candidate development of the Senior Executive Service, including the Senior Executive Service Federal Candidate Development Program;

(B) be responsible for coordinating, promoting, and monitoring programs for the advancement and training of senior executives, including mentoring programs;

(C) be responsible for the policy development, management, and oversight of the Senior Executive Service pay and performance management system;

(D) develop standards for certification of each agency's Senior Executive Service performance management system and evaluate all agency applications for certification;

(E) provide oversight of, and guidance to, agency executive resources boards;

(F) be responsible for the administration of the qualifications review board;

(G) establish and maintain annual statistics (in a form that renders such statistics useful to appointing authorities and candidates) on—

(i) the total number of career reserved positions at each agency;

(ii) the total number of vacant career reserved positions at each agency;

(iii) the amount of time it takes to hire a candidate into a career reserved position;

(iv) the number of individuals who have been certified in accordance with section 3393(c) of title 5, United States Code, and the composition of that group of individuals with regard to race, ethnicity, sex, age, and individuals with disabilities;

(v) the composition of the Senior Executive Service with regard to race, ethnicity, sex, age, and individuals with disabilities;

(vi) the composition of executive resources boards with regard to race, ethnicity, sex, and individuals with disabilities; and

(vii) the composition of qualifications review boards with regard to race, ethnicity, sex, and individuals with disabilities;

(H) make available to the public through the official public Internet site of the Office of Personnel Management, the data collected under subparagraph (G);

(I) conduct a continuing program for the recruitment of women, members of racial and ethnic minority groups, and individuals with disabilities for Senior Executive Service positions, with special efforts directed at recruiting from educational institutions, professional associations, and other sources;

(J) advise agencies on the best practices for an agency in utilizing or consulting with an agency's equal employment or diversity office or official (if the agency has such an office or official) with regard to the agency's Senior Executive Service appointments process; and

(K) administer an online survey to all individuals leaving a position in the Senior Executive Service to better understand the reasons for the departure—

(i) which shall—

(I) at a minimum request information regarding—

(aa) the reason for departure;

(bb) plans for subsequent employment; and

(cc) suggestions for improving the effectiveness of senior executives within the agency in which the individual serves and the Federal Government; and

(II) be incorporated into strategic planning by agencies, in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management; and

(ii) the results of which shall be made available to the public on a semi-annual basis through the official public Internet site of the Office of Personnel Management.

(e) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—For purposes of subparagraphs (H) and (K)(ii) of subsection (d)(2), the SES Resource Office shall combine data for any agency that is not named in section 901(b) of chapter 31, United States Code, to protect individually identifiable information.

(f) COOPERATION OF AGENCIES.—The head of each agency shall provide the Office of Personnel Management with such information as the SES Resource Office may require in order to carry out subsection (d)(2)(G).

SEC. 302. SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.

(a) EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.—Section 3396 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c)(1) Upon appointment into the Senior Executive Service, each senior executive shall create an executive development plan that includes continuing development, training, and mentoring goals. The plan shall be submitted to the head of the agency for approval. Each senior executive shall update their executive development plan on a regular basis.

"(2) The Office shall establish standards for multi-year executive development plans.".

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3151(a)(7) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 3396(c)" and inserting "section 3396(d)".

SEC. 303. SENIOR EXECUTIVE ONBOARDING PROGRAMS.

Section 3396 of title 5, United States Code, (as amended by section 302) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d)(1) In consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, the head of each agency shall oversee the establishment of an onboarding program for newly appointed career appointees and noncareer appointees.

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 180 days after the date of an initial appointment, each career appointee or noncareer appointee shall be required to successfully complete an onboarding program established under this subsection.

"(B)(i) A position described under section 5312 or 5313 may be exempt from the requirement under subparagraph (A).

"(ii) In addition to positions described in clause (i), the head of an agency may exempt appointees in very senior positions at the agency from the requirement under subparagraph (A).

"(C) The Office of Personnel Management shall establish criteria for determining which positions are very senior for purposes of this paragraph.

"(3) Each agency onboarding program shall include—

"(A) an overview of the mission, priorities, and strategic plan of the agency;

"(B) the role and responsibilities for each new appointee;

"(C) a review of individual performance objectives and goal setting;

"(D) goals for mentoring candidates for the Senior Executive Service;

"(E) an overview of the rules and regulations governing the Senior Executive Service; and

"(F) other components the head of the agency or the Office determines necessary.".

SEC. 304. SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE ROTATION PROGRAMS.

Section 3396 of title 5, United States Code, (as amended by sections 301 and 302) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e)(1)(A) In consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, an agency may establish a program to provide for inter-agency, inter-governmental, and inter-sector rotation programs for career appointees and potential career appointees in the Senior Executive Service, senior positions, and managers showing leadership potential. The rotation programs established under this section shall adhere to the principles of the Senior Executive Service by strengthening collaboration and building interagency relationships.

"(B)(i) In consultation with the Chief Privacy Officer of the Office of Personnel Management, the Office shall establish a centralized database for agencies establishing rotation programs under subparagraph (A) that—

"(I) contains information on each senior executive as defined under section 3132, including information on education, experience, training, and professional development interests; and

"(II) shall serve as a profile registry to be used by agencies and senior executives in making rotation decisions.

''(ii) The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subparagraph, including regulations to establish the database and provide for oversight, management, and administration of the database.

''(C) Each agency shall allow a senior executive the right of return from a temporary rotation detail or assignment that is not a reassignment or transfer without a loss of status and seniority.

''(2) Senior Executive Service rotations may be accomplished through the use of—

''(A) extended details;

''(B) task force assignments and interagency projects;

''(C) sabbaticals to the private sector in accordance with subsection (c);

''(D) programs established under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4701 note);

''(E) the Information Technology Exchange Program; or

''(F) other exchange programs as established by agencies.

''(3) Any career appointee in an agency may be granted a detail or sabbatical under this subsection if the appointee agrees, as a condition of accepting the detail or sabbatical, to serve in the civil service upon the completion of the detail or sabbatical for a period equal to the period of the detail or sabbatical.

''(4) The Office shall publish guidelines for specific objectives and desired results that should be obtained by a senior executive who receives a rotation assignment.

''(5)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), an agency may not require participation in a rotation program as a precondition for an appointment to a career reserved position as defined under section 3132.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the agency, under regulations prescribed by the Office—

''(i) provides adequate notice of a requirement to participate in a rotation program to candidates within the agency;

''(ii) makes opportunities under a rotation program available to those candidates; and

''(iii) provides a phase-in period for candidates to meet the rotation requirement.

''(C) The Office shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph.''.

SEC. 305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE DIVERSITY ASSURANCE

SEC. 401. CAREER APPOINTMENTS.

(a) PROMOTING DIVERSITY IN THE CAREER APPOINTMENTS PROCESS.—Section 3393(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''In establishing an executive resources board, the head of the agency shall, to the extent practicable, ensure diversity of the board and of any subgroup thereof or other evaluation panel related to the merit staffing process for career appointees, by including members of racial and ethnic minority groups, women, and individuals with disabilities.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall promulgate regulations to implement subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report evaluating agency efforts to improve diversity in executive resources boards based on the information collected by the SES Resource Office under section 301(d)(2)(G)(vi) and (vii).

SEC. 402. ENCOURAGING A MORE DIVERSE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE DIVERSITY PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each agency, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management and the Chief Human Capital Officers Council, shall submit to the Office of Personnel Management a plan to enhance and maximize opportunities for the advancement and appointment of minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities in the agency to the Senior Executive Service. Agency plans shall be reflected in the strategic human capital plan.

(2) CONTENTS.—Agency plans shall address how the agency is identifying and eliminating barriers that impair the ability of minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities to obtain appointments to the Senior Executive Service and any actions the agency is taking to provide advancement opportunities, including—

(A) conducting outreach to minorities, women, and individuals within the agency and outside the agency;

(B) establishing and maintaining training and education programs to foster leadership development;

(C) identifying career enhancing opportunities for agency employees;

(D) assessing internal availability of candidates for Senior Executive Service positions; and

(E) conducting an inventory of employee skills and addressing current and potential gaps in skills and the distribution of skills.

(3) UPDATE OF AGENCY PLANS.—Agency plans shall be updated at least every 2 years during the 10 years following enactment of this Act. An agency plan shall be reviewed by the Office of Personnel Management and, if determined to provide sufficient assurances, procedures, and commitments to provide adequate opportunities for the advancement and appointment of minorities, women, and individuals with disabilities to the Senior Executive Service, shall be approved by such Office. An agency may, in updating its plan, submit to the Office of Personnel Management an assessment of the impacts of the plan.

(b) SUMMARY AND EVALUATION.—Not later than 180 days after the deadline for the submission of any report or update under subsection (a), the Director shall transmit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report summarizing and evaluating the agency plans or updates (as the case may be) so submitted.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Office of Personnel Management shall, in carrying out subsection (a), evaluate existing requirements under section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16) and section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791) and determine how agency reporting can be performed so as to be consistent with, but not duplicative of, such sections and any other similar requirements.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 408—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS AND SONS TO WORK DAY

Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. HAGAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 408

Whereas the Take Our Daughters To Work Day program was created in New York City as a response to research that showed that, by the 8th grade, many girls were dropping out of school, had low self-esteem, and lacked confidence;

Whereas, in 2003, the name of the program was changed to ''Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day'' so that boys who face many of the same challenges as girls could also be involved in the program;

Whereas the mission of the program, to develop ''innovative strategies that empower girls and boys to overcome societal barriers to reach their full potential'', now fully reflects the addition of boys;

Whereas the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Foundation, a nonprofit organization, has grown to become one of the largest public awareness campaigns, with more than 37,000,000 participants annually in more than 3,000,000 organizations and workplaces in every State;

Whereas, in 2007, the Take Our Daughters To Work program transitioned to Elizabeth City, North Carolina, became known as the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Foundation, and received national recognition for the dedication of the Foundation to future generations;

Whereas every year, mayors, governors, and other private and public officials sign proclamations and lend their support to Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work;

Whereas the fame of the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work program has spread overseas, with requests and inquiries being made from around the world on how to operate the program;

Whereas 2012 marks the 20th anniversary of the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work program;

Whereas Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day will be observed on Thursday, April 26, 2012; and

Whereas Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work is intended to continue helping millions of girls and boys on an annual basis through experienced activities and events to examine their opportunities and strive to reach their fullest potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the goals of introducing our daughters and sons to the workplace; and

(2) commends all the participants in Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the vital role the participants play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 409—DESIGNATING APRIL 2012 AS ''FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH''

Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 409

Whereas according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, at least 25.6 percent of households in the United States, or close to 30,000,000 households with approximately 60,000,000 adults, are unbanked or underbanked and, subsequently, have missed opportunities for savings, lending, and basic financial services;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 41 percent of adults in the United States, or more than 77,000,000 adults living in the United States, gave themselves a grade of C, D, or F on their knowledge of personal finance;

Whereas according to the National Bankruptcy Research Center, the number of personal bankruptcy filings reached 1,500,000 in 2010, the highest number since 2005, and in 2011, the percentage of total consumer filings increased from 2010;

Whereas the 2011 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that only 13 percent of workers were ''very confident'' about having enough money for a comfortable retirement, a sharp decline in worker confidence from the 27 percent of workers who were ''very confident'' in 2007;

Whereas according to the 2011 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute, less than half of workers (42 percent) in the United States have tried to calculate how much they need to save for retirement;

Whereas according to a 2011 ''Flow of Funds'' report by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, household debt stood at $13,200,000,000,000 at the end of the third quarter of 2010;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 28 percent, or nearly 64,000,000 adults, admit to not paying all of their bills on time;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, only 43 percent of adults keep close track of their spending, and more than 128,400,000 adults do not know how much they spend on food, housing, and entertainment, and do not monitor their overall spending;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 1 in 3 adults in the United States, or more than 75,600,000 individuals, report that they have no savings, and only 22 percent of adults in the United States are now saving more than they did a year ago because of the current economic climate;

Whereas according to the seventh Council for Economic Education biennial Survey of the States 2011: Economic, Personal Finance, and Entrepreneurship Education in Our Nation's Schools, only 22 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement, and only 16 States require the testing of student knowledge in economics;

Whereas according to the seventh Council for Economic Education biennial Survey of the States 2011: Economic, Personal Finance, and Entrepreneurship Education in Our Nation's Schools, only 12 States require students to take a personal finance course either independently or as part of an economics course as a high school graduation requirement;

Whereas according to the Gallup-Operation HOPE Financial Literacy Index, while 69 percent of American students strongly believe that the best time to save money is now, only 57 percent believe that their parents are saving money for the future;

Whereas expanding access to the mainstream financial system will provide individuals with less expensive and more secure options for managing finances and building wealth;

Whereas quality personal financial education is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and to become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas increased financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion caused by an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas, in 2003, Congress found it important to coordinate Federal financial literacy efforts and formulate a national strategy; and

Whereas, in light of that finding, Congress passed the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.), establishing the Financial Literacy and Education Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2012 as ''Financial Literacy Month'' to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 410—HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGACY OF CÉSAR ESTRADA CHÁVEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 410

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez spent his early years on a family farm;

Whereas, at the age of 10, César Estrada Chávez joined the thousands of migrant farm workers laboring in fields and vineyards throughout the Southwest after a bank foreclosure resulted in the loss of the family farm;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez, after attending more than 30 elementary and middle schools and achieving an eighth grade education, left school to work full-time as a farm worker to help support his family;

Whereas, at the age of 17, César Estrada Chávez entered the United States Navy and served the United States with distinction for 2 years;

Whereas, in 1948, César Estrada Chávez returned from military service to marry Helen Fabela, whom he had met while working in the vineyards of central California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez and Helen Fabela had 8 children;

Whereas, as early as 1949, César Estrada Chávez was committed to organizing farm workers to campaign for safe and fair working conditions, reasonable wages, livable housing, and the outlawing of child labor;

Whereas, in 1952, César Estrada Chávez joined the Community Service Organization, a prominent Latino civil rights group, and worked with the organization—

(1) to coordinate voter registration drives; and

(2) to conduct campaigns against discrimination in East Los Angeles;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez served as the national director of the Community Service Organization;

Whereas, in 1962, César Estrada Chávez left the Community Service Organization to found the National Farm Workers Association, which eventually became the United Farm Workers of America;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was a strong believer in the principles of nonviolence practiced by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez effectively used peaceful tactics that included fasting for 25 days in 1968, 25 days in 1972, and 38 days in 1988, to call attention to the terrible working and living conditions of farm workers in the United States;

Whereas, under the leadership of César Estrada Chávez, the United Farm Workers of America organized thousands of migrant farm workers to fight for fair wages, health care coverage, pension benefits, livable housing, and respect;

Whereas, through his commitment to nonviolence, César Estrada Chávez—

(1) brought dignity and respect to the organized farm workers; and

(2) became an inspiration to and a resource for individuals engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world;

Whereas the influence of César Estrada Chávez extends far beyond agriculture and provides inspiration for those working—

(1) to better human rights;

(2) to empower workers; and

(3) to advance the American Dream that includes all inhabitants of the United States;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez died on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66 in San Luis, Arizona, only miles from his birthplace;

Whereas more than 50,000 people attended the funeral services of César Estrada Chávez in Delano, California;

Whereas César Estrada Chávez was laid to rest at the headquarters of the United Farm Workers of America, known as Nuestra Señora de La Paz, located in the Tehachapi Mountains at Keene, California;

Whereas, since the death of César Estrada Chávez, schools, parks, streets, libraries, and other public facilities, as well as awards and scholarships, have been named in his honor;

Whereas 10 States and dozens of communities across the United States honor the life and legacy of César Estrada Chávez on March 31 of each year;

Whereas, during his lifetime, César Estrada Chávez was a recipient of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Peace Prize;

Whereas, on August 8, 1994, César Estrada Chávez was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas President Barack Obama honored the life of service of César Estrada Chávez by proclaiming March 31, 2011, to be ''César Chávez Day''; and

Whereas the United States should continue the efforts of César Estrada Chávez to ensure equality, justice, and dignity for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments and example of a great hero of the United States, César Estrada Chávez;

(2) pledges to promote the legacy of César Estrada Chávez; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of César

Estrada Chávez and to always remember his great rallying cry, ''¡Sí, se puede!'', which is Spanish for ''Yes we can!''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1977. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1978. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1979. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1980. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1981. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1982. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1983. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1984. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1985. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1986. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1987. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1988. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1989. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1990. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1991. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1992. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1993. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1994. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1995. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1996. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1997. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1977. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

TITLE III—NUCLEAR WASTE FUND RELIEF AND REBATES

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Nuclear Waste Fund Relief and Rebate Act''.

SEC. 302. CERTIFICATION OF COMMITMENT TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle E of title I of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10172 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 162. CERTIFICATION OF COMMITMENT TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN SITE.

''(a) DEFINITION OF DEFENSE WASTE.—In this section, the term 'defense waste' means—

''(1) transuranic waste;

''(2) high-level radioactive waste;

''(3) spent nuclear fuel;

''(4) special nuclear materials;

''(5) greater-than-class C, low-level radioactive waste; and

''(6) any other waste arising from the production, storage, or maintenance of nuclear weapons (including components of nuclear weapons).

''(b) CERTIFICATION OF COMMITMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall publish in the Federal Register a notice that the President certifies that the Yucca Mountain site is the selected site for the development of a repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, in accordance with section 160.

''(c) FAILURE TO PUBLISH CERTIFICATION; REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—If the President fails to publish the certification of the President in accordance with subsection (b), or if the President revokes the certification of the President after the date described in that subsection, not later than 1 year after the date described in subsection (b), or the date of revocation, as appropriate, and in accordance with subsection (d)—

''(1) each entity that is required under section 302 to make a payment to the Secretary shall not be required to make any additional payment; and

''(2) each entity that has made a payment under section 302 shall receive from the Secretary of the Treasury, from amounts available in the Nuclear Waste Fund, an amount equal to the aggregate amount of the payments made by the entity (including interest on the aggregate amount of the payments) to the Secretary for deposit in the Nuclear Waste Fund.

''(d) USE OF RETURNED PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), of the aggregate amount of payments returned to an entity described in subsection (c)(2)—

''(A) 75 percent shall be used by the entity to provide rebates to ratepayers of the entity; and

''(B) 25 percent shall be used by the entity to carry out upgrades to nuclear power facilities of the entity to enhance the storage and security of materials used to generate nuclear power.

''(2) DEFENSE WASTE.—In the case of a payment required to be paid to an entity for the storage of defense waste, the Secretary shall use the amount required to be paid to the entity to meet the penalty payment obligation of the Secretary under subsection (e)(2) to the State in which the entity is located.

''(e) DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE WASTE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2017, the Secretary shall initiate the transportation of defense waste from each State in which defense waste is located to the Yucca Mountain site.

''(2) PENALTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), if the Secretary fails to initiate the transportation of defense waste in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall pay to each State in which defense waste is located $1,000,000 for each day that the defense waste is located in the State until the date on which the Secretary initiates the transportation of the defense waste under paragraph (1).

''(B) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Subject to subsection (c)(2), for each calendar year, the Secretary shall not pay to any State described in subparagraph (A) an amount greater than $100,000,000.

''(C) REQUIRED USE OF PAYMENTS.—A State that receives amounts through a payment from the Secretary under this paragraph shall use the amounts—

''(i) to help offset the loss in community investments that results from the continued storage of defense waste in the State; and

''(ii) to help mitigate the public health risks that result from the continued storage of defense waste in the State.

''(f) DETERMINATION BY COMMISSION TO GRANT OR AMEND LICENSES.—In determining whether to grant or amend any license to operate any civilian nuclear power reactor, or high-level radioactive waste or spent fuel storage or treatment facility, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the responsibilities of the President and the Secretary described in this subtitle shall be considered to be sufficient and independent grounds for the Commission to determine the existence of reasonable assurances that spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste would be disposed of safely and in a timely manner by the entity that is the subject of the determination.

''(g) EFFECTS.—

''(1) TERMINATION OF PAYMENT REQUIREMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF RETURNED PAYMENTS.—With respect to an entity that receives a benefit under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c)—

''(A) the entity shall not be considered by the Commission to be in violation under section 302(b); and

''(B) the Commission shall not refuse to take any action with respect to a current or prospective license of the entity on the grounds that the entity has cancelled or rescinded a contract to which the entity is a party as the result of—

''(i) the failure by the entity to make a payment to the Secretary under section 302; or

''(ii) the acceptance by the entity of amounts described in subsection (c)(2).

''(2) DISPOSITION OF WASTE.—Nothing in this section affects the responsibility of the

Federal Government under any Act (including regulations) with respect to the ultimate disposition of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. prec. 10101) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle E of title I the following:

''Sec. 162. Certification of commitment to Yucca Mountain site.''.

SA 1978. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 221. EXEMPTION OF SAND DUNE LIZARD FROM ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.

Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) EXEMPTION OF SAND DUNE LIZARD.—This Act shall not apply to the sand dune lizard.''.

SA 1979. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 119. QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 46 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6), and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) the qualifying offshore wind facility credit.''.

(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 48D the following new section:

''SEC. 48E. CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the qualifying offshore wind facility credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 30 percent of the qualified investment for such taxable year with respect to any qualifying offshore wind facility of the taxpayer.

''(b) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the qualified investment for any taxable year is the basis of eligible property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility.

''(2) CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURES RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this section.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualifying offshore wind facility' means an offshore facility using wind to produce electricity the megawatt capacity of which does not exceed the capacity certified by the Secretary as eligible for the credit under this section.

''(B) OFFSHORE FACILITY.—The term 'offshore facility' means any facility located in the inland navigable waters of the United States, including the Great Lakes, or in the coastal waters of the United States, including the territorial seas of the United States, the exclusive economic zone of United States, and the outer Continental Shelf of the United States.

''(2) ELIGIBLE PROPERTY.—The term 'eligible property' means any property—

''(A) which is—

''(i) tangible personal property, or

''(ii) other tangible property (not including a building or its structural components), but only if such property is used as an integral part of the qualifying offshore wind facility, and

''(B) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable.

''(d) QUALIFYING CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, shall establish a qualifying credit for offshore wind facilities program to consider and award certifications for qualified investments eligible for credits under this section to qualifying offshore wind facility sponsors.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount of megawatt capacity for offshore facilities with respect to which credits may be allocated under the program shall not exceed 3,000 megawatts.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) APPLICATION PERIOD.—Each applicant for certification under this paragraph shall submit an application containing such information as the Secretary may require beginning on the date the Secretary establishes the program under paragraph (1).

''(B) PERIOD OF ISSUANCE.—An applicant which receives a certification shall have 5 years from the date of issuance of the certification in order to place the facility in service and if such facility is not placed in service by that time period, then the certification shall no longer be valid.

''(3) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In determining which qualifying offshore wind facilities to certify under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(A) take into consideration which facilities will be placed in service at the earliest date, and

''(B) take into account the technology of the facility that may lead to reduced industry and consumer costs or expand access to offshore wind.

''(4) REVIEW, ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS, AND REALLOCATIONS.—

''(A) REVIEW.—Periodically, but not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall review the credits allocated under this section as of the date of such review.

''(B) ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary may make additional allocations and reallocations of credits under this section if the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the limitation under paragraph (1)(B) has not been attained at the time of the review, or

''(ii) scheduled placed-in-service dates of previously certified facilities have been significantly delayed and the Secretary determines the applicant will not meet the timeline pursuant to paragraph (2)(B).

''(C) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—If the Secretary determines that credits under this section are available for further allocation or reallocation, but there is an insufficient quantity of qualifying applications for certification pending at the time of the review, the Secretary is authorized to conduct an additional program for applications for certification.

''(5) DISCLOSURE OF ALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall, upon making a certification under this subsection, publicly disclose the identity of the applicant and the amount of the credit with respect to such applicant.

''(e) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—A credit shall not be allowed under this section with respect to any facility if—

''(1) a credit has been allowed to such facility under section 45 for such taxable year or any prior taxable year,

''(2) a credit has been allowed with respect to such facility under section 46 by reason of section 48(a) or 48C(a) for such taxable or any preceding taxable year, or

''(3) a grant has been made with respect to such facility under section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 49(a)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (v),

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting '', and'', and

(C) by adding after clause (vi) the following new clause:

''(vi) the basis of any property which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility under section 48E.''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48D the following new item:

''48E. Credit for offshore wind facilities.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SA 1980. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER DOLLARS FROM SUPPORTING HIGH-RISK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS BY COMPANIES THAT EMPLOY 1,000 INDIVIDUALS OR MORE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy shall put in place limitations on funding awards at the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy that prevent companies that employ 1,000 or more individuals from receiving funding awards.

SA 1981. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle C__Energy Subsidies for Millionaires

SEC. 221. NO RESIDENTIAL ENERGY EFFICIENT PROPERTY CREDIT FOR MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 25D(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) NO CREDIT FOR MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any taxable year with respect to any taxpayer with an adjusted gross income equal to or greater than $1,000,000 for such taxable year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SA 1982. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.___. CONSOLIDATING UNNECESSARY DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING ENERGY PROGRAMS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law and not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Department of Energy and the heads of the relevant department and agencies to—

(1) use available administrative authority to eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government energy-related programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions identified in the—

(A) March 2011 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 11 318SP) regarding federal fleet energy goals and ethanol production; and

(B) February 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 12 342SP) regarding Department of Energy contractor support costs, nuclear proliferation, diesel emissions, and green building initiatives;

(2) identify and report to Congress any legislative changes required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government energy-related programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions identified in the—

(A) March 2011 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 11 318SP); and

(B) February 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 12 342SP);

(3) determine the total cost savings that shall result to each agency, office, and department from the actions described in paragraph (1); and

(4) rescind from the appropriate accounts and apply the savings towards deficit reduction the amount greater of—

(A) $2,000,000,000; or

(B) the total amount of cost savings estimated by paragraph (3).

SA 1983. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Office of Fossil Energy to carry out any energy research relating to fossil fuels, except that nothing in this section affects the responsibilities of the Secretary of Energy relating to national petroleum reserves.

SA 1984. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

(a) APPROVAL OF CROSS-BORDER FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution (delegating to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations), TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. is authorized to construct, connect, operate, and maintain pipeline facilities, subject to subsection (c), for the import of crude oil and other hydrocarbons at the United States-Canada Border at Phillips County, Montana, in accordance with the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended).

(2) PERMIT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no permit pursuant to Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note) or any other similar Executive Order regulating construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of facilities at the borders of the United States, and no additional environmental impact statement, shall be required for TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. to construct, connect, operate, and maintain the facilities described in paragraph (1).

(b) CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE IN UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The final environmental impact statement issued by the Department of State on August 26, 2011, shall be considered to satisfy all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review with respect to the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a)(1) and the related facilities in the United States described in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended).

(2) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a)(1), and the related facilities in the United States described in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended), shall remain in effect.

(c) CONDITIONS.—In constructing, connecting, operating, and maintaining the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a)(1) and related facilities in the United States described in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended), TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall comply with the following conditions:

(1) TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall comply with all applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations) and all applicable industrial codes regarding the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the facilities.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (a)(2), TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall comply with all requisite permits from Canadian authorities and applicable Federal, State, and local government agencies in the United States.

(3) TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall take all appropriate measures to prevent or mitigate any adverse environmental impact or disruption of historic properties in connection with the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the facilities.

(4) The construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the facilities shall be—

(A) in all material respects, similar to that described in—

(i) the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended); and

(ii) the final environmental impact statement described in subsection (b)(1); and

(B) carried out in accordance with—

(i) the construction, mitigation, and reclamation measures agreed to for the project in the construction mitigation and reclamation plan contained in appendix B of the final environmental impact statement described in subsection (b)(1);

(ii) the special conditions agreed to between the owners and operators of the project and the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation, as contained in appendix U of the final environmental impact statement;

(iii) the measures identified in appendix H of the final environmental impact statement, if the modified route submitted by the State of Nebraska to the Secretary of State crosses the Sand Hills region; and

(iv) the stipulations identified in appendix S of the final environmental impact statement.

(d) ROUTE IN NEBRASKA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any route and construction, mitigation, and reclamation measures for the project in the State of Nebraska that is identified by the State of Nebraska and submitted to the Secretary of State under this section is considered sufficient for the purposes of this section.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Construction of the facilities in the United States described in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended), shall not commence in the State of Nebraska until the date on which the Secretary of State receives a route for the project in the State of Nebraska that is identified by the State of Nebraska.

(3) RECEIPT.—On the date of receipt of the route described in paragraph (1) by the Secretary of State, the route for the project within the State of Nebraska under this section shall supersede the route for the project in the State specified in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (including supplements and amendments).

(4) COOPERATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the State of Nebraska submits a request to the Secretary of State or any appropriate Federal official, the Secretary of State or Federal official shall provide assistance that is consistent with the law of the State of Nebraska.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any action taken to carry out this section (including the modification of any route under subsection (d)) shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) STATE SITING AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section alters any provision of State law relating to the siting of pipelines.

(3) PRIVATE PROPERTY.—Nothing in this section alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the project.

(f) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The cross-border facilities described in subsection (a)(1), and the related facilities in the United States described in the application filed with the Department of State on September 19, 2008 (as supplemented and amended), that are approved by this section, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

SA 1985. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. EXPEDITED FEDERAL PERMITTING AND REVIEW DECISIONS FOR ENERGY, NATURAL RESOURCE, AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) it is imperative to significantly reduce the aggregate time required to make decisions by the Federal Government on the permitting and review of energy, natural resource, and energy infrastructure projects, while improving environmental and community outcomes;

(2) investing in the energy infrastructure of the United States provides immediate and long-term economic benefits for local communities and the United States as a whole;

(3) Federal permitting and review processes, including planning, approval, and consultation processes, have a substantive impact on the economy of the United States;

(4) it is critical that Executive agencies take all steps, within the authority and resources of the Executive agencies, to execute Federal permitting and review processes with maximum efficiency and effectiveness, while ensuring the health, safety, and security of communities, the environment, and vital economic growth;

(5) Federal permitting and review processes should—

(A) provide a transparent, consistent, and predictable path for project sponsors and affected communities;

(B) ensure that Executive agencies—

(i) establish and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of reviews;

(ii) establish clear permitting performance goals; and

(iii) track progress against those goals;

(C) encourage early collaboration among Executive agencies, State, local, and tribal governments, project sponsors, and affected stakeholders to incorporate and address affected interests and minimize delays;

(D) provide for transparency and accountability by using cost-effective information technology to collect and disseminate information concerning individual projects and Executive agency performance;

(E) rely on early and active consultation with State, local, and tribal governments to avoid conflicts or duplication of effort, resolve concerns, and allow for concurrent rather than sequential reviews;

(F) recognize the critical role project sponsors play in ensuring the timely and cost-effective review of projects by providing complete information and analysis and by supporting, as appropriate, the costs associated with review; and

(G) enable Executive agencies—

(i) to share priorities;

(ii) to work collaboratively and concurrently to advance reviews and permitting decisions; and

(iii) to facilitate the resolution of disputes at all levels of Executive agency organization;

(6) each of the actions described in paragraph (5) should be incorporated into routine Executive agency practice to provide demonstrable improvements in the performance of Federal infrastructure permitting and review processes, including lower costs, more timely decisions, and a healthier and cleaner environment; and

(7) it is imperative to institutionalize best practices—

(A) to enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal government coordination on permitting and review processes (such as conducting reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the maximum extent practicable);

(B) to avoid duplicative reviews;

(C) to engage stakeholders early in the permitting process; and

(D) to develop mechanisms to better communicate priorities and resolve disputes among Executive agencies at the national and regional levels.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED REGULATIONS.—The term ''covered regulations'' means regulations issued to carry out permitting processes for—

(A) any energy or natural resource development project on Federal land that requires the approval of the Federal Government; or

(B) any interstate energy transmission or transportation infrastructure project through electrical lines or pipelines that requires the approval of the Federal Government.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PROJECT.—The term ''project'' means—

(A) any energy or mineral development project on Federal land that requires the approval of the Federal Government; or

(B) any interstate energy transmission or transportation infrastructure project through electrical lines or pipelines that requires the approval of the Federal Government.

(c) COVERED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each Executive agency shall amend the covered regulations of the Executive agency—

(1) to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the time required to make permitting and review decisions on projects and to execute Federal permitting and review processes with maximum efficiency and effectiveness, while ensuring the health, safety, and security of communities, the environment, and vital economic growth; and

(2) to incorporate specific and measurable actions to carry out paragraph (1), including actions such as—

(A) performance metrics, including timelines or schedules for review;

(B) technological improvements, such as institutionalized use of Dashboard and other information technology systems; and

(C) improved preapplication procedures;

(D) early collaboration with other Executive agencies, project sponsors, and affected stakeholders; and

(E) coordination with State, local, and tribal governments.

SEC. 2. ADOPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CIRCULATE.—The term ''circulate'' means to distribute an environmental impact statement to another agency for the consideration of that agency.

(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term ''cooperating agency'' means any agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term ''environmental assessment'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.9 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(5) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ''environmental document'' means an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment.

(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ''environmental impact statement'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.11 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(7) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term ''finding of no significant impact'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.13 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(8) HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.—The term ''human environment'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.14 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(9) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ''lead agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.16 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(10) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—The term ''major Federal action'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.18 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(11) NOTICE OF INTENT.—The term ''notice of intent'' has the meaning given the term in section 1508.22 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(b) ADOPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—If an agency determines that an environmental assessment should be prepared for a proposed action relating to oil and gas development on Federal public land or water, the agency shall adopt, in whole or in part, an existing Federal draft or final environmental assessment if—

(1) the existing assessment meets the standards for an adequate assessment under the regulations promulgated by the agency and the Council on Environmental Quality;

(2) the action covered by the existing assessment and the proposed action are substantially the same; and

(3) there are no significant new circumstances or information relating to the quality of the human environment affected by the proposed action.

(c) PUBLICATION OF FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND NOTICES OF INTENT.—

(1) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—If a proposed action is determined not to be a major Federal action that significantly affects the quality of the human environment under the National Environmental Policy

Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), an agency adopting an existing environmental assessment under subsection (b) shall publish for public review a finding of no significant impact in accordance with the regulations of the agency.

(2) NOTICE OF INTENT.—If a proposed action is determined to be a major Federal action that significantly affects the quality of the human environment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), an agency adopting an existing environmental assessment under subsection (b) shall publish for public review a notice of intent in accordance with the regulations of the agency.

(d) ADOPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—If a proposed action of an agency relating to oil and gas development on Federal public land or water is determined to be a major Federal action that significantly affects the quality of the human environment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the agency shall adopt, in whole or in part, an existing Federal draft or final environmental impact statement if—

(1) the existing statement meets the standards for an adequate statement under the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality;

(2) the action covered by the existing statement and the proposed action are substantially the same; and

(3) there are no significant new circumstances or information relating to the quality of the human environment affected by the proposed action.

(e) RECIRCULATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

(1) DRAFT STATEMENT.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an agency adopting an environmental impact statement of another agency shall recirculate the statement as a draft statement.

(2) FINAL STATEMENT.—An agency adopting the final environmental impact statement of another agency shall recirculate the statement as a final statement.

(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—A cooperating agency adopting the environmental impact statement of a lead agency shall not recirculate the statement if the cooperating agency determines, after an independent review of the statement, that the comments and suggestions of the cooperating agency have been satisfied.

(f) FINALITY OF ADOPTED DOCUMENT.—An agency may not adopt as final an environmental document prepared by another agency if, at the time of the proposed adoption—

(1) the existing document was not final within the agency that prepared the environmental document;

(2) the adequacy of the existing document is the subject of a pending judicial action; or

(3) in the case of an environmental impact statement, the action the existing statement assesses is the subject of a referral under part 1504 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly known as ''Predecision referrals to the Council of proposed Federal actions determined to be environmentally unsatisfactory'') (or a successor regulation).

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The decision of an agency to adopt, in whole or in part, an existing environmental assessment or environmental impact statement shall not be subject to judicial review.

(h) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an agency shall not adopt, in whole or in part, an existing environmental impact statement when issuing a proposed or final rule.

SEC. 3. STATE COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall—

(1) survey the use by the Secretary of categorical exclusions in the issuance of permits since fiscal year 2005;

(2) publish a review of the survey that includes a description of—

(A) the types of actions categorically excluded; and

(B) any requests previously received by the Secretary for new categorical exclusions; and

(3) solicit requests from State natural resources permitting agencies or other State, local, and tribal government agencies for new categorical exclusions.

(b) NEW CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking that proposes new categorical exclusions, taking into account the survey under subsection (a), subject to the condition that the new categorical exclusions meet the criteria for a categorical exclusion under section 1508.4 of title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of on which the notice of proposed rulemaking is issued).

(c) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS PROVIDED BY LAW.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each issue final rules implementing section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942).

(d) PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall seek opportunities to enter into programmatic agreements with States that establish efficient administrative procedures for carrying out environmental and other required project reviews.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Programmatic agreements authorized under paragraph (1) may include agreements that allow a State to determine on behalf of the relevant Department whether a project is categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—A programmatic agreement described in subparagraph (A) may include determinations by the Secretary of the types of projects categorically excluded (consistent with section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations or successor regulations) in the State in addition to the types of projects described in section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14942).

SEC. 4. EFFICIENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR PROJECT DECISIONMAKING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or Indian tribal government.

(2) CHAIRMAN.—The term ''Chairman'' means the chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ''environmental impact statement'' means the detailed statement of environmental impacts required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''environmental review process'' means the process of preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document for a project under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''environmental review process'' includes the process and completion of any environmental permit, approval, review, or study required for a project under any Federal law other than the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(5) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ''lead agency'' means—

(A) in the case of energy or mineral development on Federal land, the Department of the Interior;

(B) in the case of interstate energy transmission or transportation through electrical lines or pipelines, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and

(C) any State or local governmental entity serving as a joint lead agency pursuant to this section.

(6) PROJECT.—The term ''project'' means—

(A) any energy or mineral development project on Federal land that requires the approval of the Federal Government; or

(B) any interstate energy transmission or transportation infrastructure project through electrical lines or pipelines that requires the approval of the Federal Government.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project development procedures under this section—

(A) shall apply to all projects for which an environmental impact statement is prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) may be applied, as determined by the Secretary or Chairman, to projects for which an environmental document is prepared pursuant to that Act.

(2) FLEXIBILITY.—Any authority granted to the Secretary or Chairman under this section may be exercised for a project, class of projects, or program of projects.

(c) LEAD AGENCIES.—

(1) FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.—The Department of the Interior or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, as applicable, shall be the Federal lead agency in the environmental review process for a project.

(2) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section precludes another agency from acting as a joint lead agency in accordance with regulations issued under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(3) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary or Chairman, as applicable, shall ensure that the project complies with all design and mitigation commitments made in any environmental document prepared in accordance with this section and that the environmental document is appropriately supplemented if project modifications become necessary.

(4) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—Any environmental document prepared in accordance with this section may be adopted or used by any Federal agency making any approval to the same extent that the Federal agency could adopt or use a document prepared by another Federal agency.

(5) ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LEAD AGENCY.—With respect to the environmental review process for any project, the lead agency shall have the authority and responsibility—

(A) to carry out any actions that are necessary and proper, within the authority of the lead agency, to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the project; and

(B) to prepare or ensure that any required environmental impact statement or other document required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is completed in accordance with this section and applicable Federal law.

(d) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall be responsible for inviting and designating participating agencies in accordance with this subsection.

(2) INVITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review process for a project, any other Federal and non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the project, and shall invite those agencies to become participating agencies in the environmental review process for the project.

(B) DEADLINE.—The invitation shall state a deadline by which responses shall be submitted to the lead agency, which may be extended by the lead agency for good cause.

(3) FEDERAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—Any Federal agency that is invited by the lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project shall be designated as a participating agency by the lead agency unless the invited agency informs the lead agency, in writing, by the deadline specified in the invitation that the invited agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project;

(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the project; and

(C) does not intend to submit comments on the project.

(4) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Designation as a participating agency under this subsection shall not imply that the participating agency—

(A) supports a proposed project;

(B) has any jurisdiction over the project; or

(C) has special expertise with respect to the evaluation of the project.

(5) COOPERATING AGENCY.—A participating agency may also be designated by a lead agency as a cooperating agency under part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(6) DESIGNATIONS FOR CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary or Chairman, as applicable, may exercise the authorities granted under this subsection for a project, class of projects, or program of projects.

(7) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) carry out obligations of the Federal agency under other applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction, with the review required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), unless doing so would impair the ability of the Federal agency to carry out those obligations; and

(B) formulate and implement administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

(e) PROJECT INITIATION.—The project sponsor shall notify the Secretary or Chairman, as applicable, of the type and general location of the proposed project, together with a statement of any Federal approvals anticipated to be necessary for the proposed project, for the purpose of informing the Secretary or Chairman that the environmental review process should be initiated.

(f) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As early as practicable during the environmental review process, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for participating agencies and the public to participate in defining the purpose and need for a project.

(2) SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for participation under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall prepare a statement of purpose and need for any document that the lead agency is responsible for preparing for the project.

(B) OBJECTIVES.—The statement of purpose and need shall include a clear statement of the objectives that the proposed action is intended to achieve, which may include—

(i) increasing energy and mineral security; and

(ii) reducing energy, mineral, and natural resource costs to consumers.

(3) ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As early as practicable during the environmental review process, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for participating agencies and the public to participate in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for a project.

(B) RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES.—After providing an opportunity for participation under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall determine the range of alternatives for consideration in any document that the lead agency is responsible for preparing for the project.

(C) METHODOLOGIES.—The lead agency, in collaboration with the participating agencies, shall determine, at appropriate times during the study process, the methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative for a project.

(D) PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.—At the discretion of the lead agency, the lead agency may—

(i) identify a preferred alternative for a project; and

(ii) develop a more detailed analysis for that alternative than other alternatives to facilitate the development of mitigation measures or concurrent compliance with other applicable laws, subject to the condition that the lead agency determines that the development of the more detailed analysis will not prevent the lead agency from making an impartial decision as to whether to accept another alternative under consideration.

(g) COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING.—

(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comment on the environmental review process for a project or category of projects, which may be incorporated in a memorandum of understanding.

(B) SCHEDULE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency may establish as part of the coordination plan, after consultation with each participating agency for the project and with each State in which the project is located, a schedule for completion of the environmental review process for the project.

(ii) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the schedule, the lead agency shall consider factors such as—

(I) the responsibilities of participating agencies under applicable laws;

(II) the resources available to the participating agencies;

(III) the overall size and complexity of the project;

(IV) the overall schedule for and cost of the project; and

(V) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that could be affected by the project.

(C) ADMINISTRATION.—A schedule under subparagraph (B) shall be consistent with any other relevant schedule required under Federal law.

(D) MODIFICATIONS.—The lead agency may—

(i) extend a schedule established under subparagraph (B) for good cause; and

(ii) reduce a schedule established under subparagraph (B) only with the concurrence of the affected participating agencies.

(E) DISSEMINATION.—A copy of a schedule under subparagraph (B), including any modifications to the schedule, shall be—

(i) provided to all participating agencies and to the relevant agencies of each State in which the project is located; and

(ii) made available to the public.

(2) COMMENT DEADLINES.—The lead agency shall establish comment deadlines for agencies and the public such that—

(A) the comment period on draft environmental impact statements shall last for a period of not more than 60 days after the date on which the notice of the date of public availability of the document is published in the Federal Register, unless—

(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency and all participating agencies; or

(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause;

(B) the comment period on the environmental review process shall last for a period of not more than 30 days after the date on which the materials on which comment is requested are available, unless—

(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency and all participating agencies; or

(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

(3) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—In any case in which a decision under any Federal law relating to a project (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license) is required to be made by a date that is not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Secretary or Chairman, as applicable, has made all final decisions of the lead agency with respect to the project, or not later than 180 days after the date on which an application was submitted for the permit or license, the Secretary or Chairman, as applicable, shall submit to the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives—

(A) as soon as practicable after the 180-day period, an initial notice of the failure of the Federal agency to make the decision; and

(B) every 60 days thereafter until such date as all decisions of the Federal agency relating to the project have been made by the Federal agency, an additional notice that describes the number of decisions of the Federal agency that remain outstanding as of the date of the additional notice.

(4) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this subsection reduces any time period under existing Federal law, including regulations, for which public comment is provided in the environmental review process.

(h) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency and the participating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

(2) LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall make information available to the participating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding the environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration.

(B) BASIS OF INFORMATION.—The information described in subparagraph (A) may be based on existing data sources, including geographical information systems mapping.

(3) PARTICIPATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Based on any information received from the lead agency under paragraph (2), each participating agency shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project.

(4) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—At any time, at the request of the Governor of a State in which the project is located, the lead agency shall promptly convene a meeting with the relevant participating agencies and the Governor to resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

(B) NOTICE THAT RESOLUTION CANNOT BE ACHIEVED.—If a resolution cannot be achieved by a date that is not later than 30 days after the date on which the meeting under subparagraph (A) occurs and the lead agency determines that all information necessary to resolve the issue has been obtained, the lead agency shall—

(i) notify the heads of all participating agencies, the Governor, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Council on Environmental Quality; and

(ii) publish the notification in the Federal Register.

(i) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program to measure and report on any progress made toward improving and expediting the planning and environmental review process.

(j) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (k), nothing in this section affects the reviewability of any final Federal agency action in a court of the United States or in the court of any State.

(2) NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section—

(A) supersedes, amends, or modifies the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or any other Federal environmental statute;

(B) affects the responsibility of any Federal officer to comply with or enforce any such statute; or

(C) preempts or interferes with—

(i) any practice of seeking, considering, or responding to public comment;

(ii) any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority that a Federal, State, local government agency, or Indian tribe has with respect to carrying out a project; or

(iii) any other provision of law applicable to a project.

(k) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for a project shall be barred unless the claim is filed by not later than 180 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law pursuant to which judicial review is allowed.

(2) NO RIGHT TO REVIEW OR LIMIT ON CLAIM.—Nothing in this subsection—

(A) establishes any right to judicial review; or

(B) places any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

(3) NEW INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consider new information received after the close of a comment period if the information satisfies the requirements for a supplemental environmental impact statement under section 1502.9(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(B) PREPARATION OF NEW STATEMENT.—With respect to the preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement, when required—

(i) the preparation of such a statement shall be considered to be a separate final agency action; and

(ii) the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of that action shall be 180 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing the action.

(l) ACCELERATED DECISIONMAKING IN ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When preparing a final environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), if the lead agency makes changes in response to comments that are minor and are confined to factual corrections or explanations of why the comments do not warrant further agency response, the lead agency may write on errata sheets attached to the statement instead of rewriting the draft statement, on the condition that the errata sheets—

(A) cite the sources, authorities, or reasons that support the position of the agency; and

(B) if appropriate, indicate the circumstances that would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

(2) INCORPORATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the lead agency shall expeditiously develop a single document that consists of a final environmental impact statement and a record of decision unless—

(A) the final environmental impact statement makes substantial changes to the proposed action that are relevant to environmental or safety concerns; or

(B) there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and that bear on the proposed action or the impacts of the proposed action.

SA 1986. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. EXPEDITED FEDERAL PERMITTING AND REVIEW DECISIONS FOR ENERGY, NATURAL RESOURCE, AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) it is imperative to significantly reduce the aggregate time required to make decisions by the Federal Government on the permitting and review of energy, natural resource, and energy infrastructure projects, while improving environmental and community outcomes;

(2) investing in the energy infrastructure of the United States provides immediate and long-term economic benefits for local communities and the United States as a whole;

(3) Federal permitting and review processes, including planning, approval, and consultation processes, have a substantive impact on the economy of the United States;

(4) it is critical that Executive agencies take all steps, within the authority and resources of the Executive agencies, to execute Federal permitting and review processes with maximum efficiency and effectiveness, while ensuring the health, safety, and security of communities, the environment, and vital economic growth;

(5) Federal permitting and review processes should—

(A) provide a transparent, consistent, and predictable path for project sponsors and affected communities;

(B) ensure that Executive agencies—

(i) establish and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of reviews;

(ii) establish clear permitting performance goals; and

(iii) track progress against those goals;

(C) encourage early collaboration among Executive agencies, State, local, and tribal governments, project sponsors, and affected stakeholders to incorporate and address affected interests and minimize delays;

(D) provide for transparency and accountability by using cost-effective information technology to collect and disseminate information concerning individual projects and Executive agency performance;

(E) rely on early and active consultation with State, local, and tribal governments to avoid conflicts or duplication of effort, resolve concerns, and allow for concurrent rather than sequential reviews;

(F) recognize the critical role project sponsors play in ensuring the timely and cost-effective review of projects by providing complete information and analysis and by supporting, as appropriate, the costs associated with review; and

(G) enable Executive agencies—

(i) to share priorities;

(ii) to work collaboratively and concurrently to advance reviews and permitting decisions; and

(iii) to facilitate the resolution of disputes at all levels of Executive agency organization;

(6) each of the actions described in paragraph (5) should be incorporated into routine Executive agency practice to provide demonstrable improvements in the performance of Federal infrastructure permitting and review processes, including lower costs, more timely decisions, and a healthier and cleaner environment; and

(7) it is imperative to institutionalize best practices—

(A) to enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal government coordination on permitting and review processes (such as conducting reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the maximum extent practicable);

(B) to avoid duplicative reviews;

(C) to engage stakeholders early in the permitting process; and

(D) to develop mechanisms to better communicate priorities and resolve disputes among Executive agencies at the national and regional levels.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED REGULATIONS.—The term "covered regulations" means regulations issued to carry out permitting processes for—

(A) any energy or natural resource development project on Federal land that requires the approval of the Federal Government; or

(B) any interstate energy transmission or transportation infrastructure project through electrical lines or pipelines that requires the approval of the Federal Government.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PROJECT.—The term ''project'' means—

(A) any energy or mineral development project on Federal land that requires the approval of the Federal Government; or

(B) any interstate energy transmission or transportation infrastructure project through electrical lines or pipelines that requires the approval of the Federal Government.

(c) COVERED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each Executive agency shall amend the covered regulations of the Executive agency—

(1) to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the time required to make permitting and review decisions on projects and to execute Federal permitting and review processes with maximum efficiency and effectiveness, while ensuring the health, safety, and security of communities, the environment, and vital economic growth; and

(2) to incorporate specific and measurable actions to carry out paragraph (1), including actions such as—

(A) performance metrics, including timelines or schedules for review;

(B) technological improvements, such as institutionalized use of Dashboard and other information technology systems; and

(C) improved preapplication procedures;

(D) early collaboration with other Executive agencies, project sponsors, and affected stakeholders; and

(E) coordination with State, local, and tribal governments.

SA 1987. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, strike lines 9 through 12, and insert the following:

(b) WIND FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''January 1, 2013'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''.

(2) REDUCED CREDIT RATE FOR WIND FACILITIES FOR 2013 AND 2014 AND TERMINATION AFTER 2014.—Subparagraph (A) of section 45(b)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''In the case of'' and inserting:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) WIND FACILITIES.—In the case of electricity produced and sold in any calendar year after 2012 at any qualified facility described in subsection (d)(1), the amount in effect under subsection (a)(1) for such calendar year (determined before the application of the last sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection) shall be—

''(I) reduced by one-third in calendar year 2013,

''(II) reduced by two-thirds in calendar year 2014, and

''(III) zero after calendar year 2014.''.

(3) NO EXTENSION OF GRANTS FOR SPECIFIED ENERGY PROPERTY IN LIEU OF TAX CREDITS.—The amendments made by subsection (d) of this section and section 116 of this Act are hereby deemed null, void, and of no effect.

SA 1988. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 115 and insert the following:

SEC. 115. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS EXCISE TAX CREDITS.

(a) EXTENSION.—

(1) EXCISE TAX CREDITS.—Sections 6426(d)(5) and 6426(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking ''December 31, 2011 (September 30, 2014, in the case of any sale or use involving liquified hydrogen)'' and inserting ''December 31, 2015''.

(2) PAYMENTS.—Section 6427(e)(6) of such Code is amended by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B) and by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting the following:

''(C) any alternative fuel or alternative fuel mixture (as defined in subsection (d)(2) or (e)(3) of section 6426) sold or used after December 31, 2015.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF CREDIT TO USE IN TRAINS.—Paragraph (1) of section 6426(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''in a motor vehicle or motorboat'' and inserting ''in a motor vehicle, motorboat, or vehicle on rail''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after December 31, 2011.

SA 1989. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CLEAN VEHICLE CORRIDORS PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Traditional transportation refueling networks are well-established, but market uncertainties continue to hamper the full use of cleaner-burning domestic energy resources.

(2) Despite considerable investor interest, higher capital costs and an uncertain consumer base has limited expansion of cleaner-burning alternative refueling options and its customer base.

(3) Reduced emissions and energy independence are important factors at a national level, but they are not a sufficient inducement to create large-scale changes.

(4) While American-made fuels provide many energy security and environmental benefits, a significant portion of imported oil continues to be consumed as diesel fuel in on-road motor vehicles.

(5) Motor vehicles fueled by domestically-generated, cleaner-burning transportation fuels, such as compressed natural gas, liquified natural gas, propane, electricity, and biofuels, can pay for themselves over time, but sales of such vehicles, other than return-to-base vehicles, have been hampered because of insufficient refueling infrastructure.

(6) Simultaneous facilitation of infrastructure development and a robust customer base is needed to avoid penalizing current users or early adopters.

(7) Facilitating focused infrastructure development along designated routes will foster an expansion of alternative fuel vehicles and increase the likelihood for commercial success.

(8) Eliminating the logistical barriers that are delaying infrastructure development along clean vehicle corridors will—

(A) provide alternative refueling stations with a larger customer base;

(B) attract more buyers to the purchase of clean vehicles; and

(C) provide new market outlets for clean fuel providers.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to provide market certainty to drive private and commercial capital investment in clean transportation options;

(2) to promote clean transportation technologies that will—

(A) lead to increased diversity and dissemination of alternative fuel options; and

(B) enable the United States to bridge the gap from foreign energy imports to secure, domestically produced energy; and

(3) to facilitate clean transportation incentives that will—

(A) attract a critical mass of clean transportation vehicles that will give alternative fueling stations an assured customer base and market certitude;

(B) provide for ongoing increases in energy demands;

(C) support the growth of jobs and businesses in the United States; and

(D) reduce petroleum use and emissions by vehicles.

(c) CLEAN VEHICLE CORRIDORS PROGRAM.—

(1) CORRIDOR DESIGNATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall designate 10 ''Clean Vehicle Corridors'' along Federal highways or other contiguous highways.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In making designations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with the Secretary of Transportation; and

(ii) gather information from Federal, State, and local governments, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals to help determine which highways should be included in the corridors designated under subparagraph (A).

(2) INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) CLEANER-BURNING FUELS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall encourage the addition of alternative fueling options and other supporting infrastructure along Clean Vehicle Corridors. These refueling stations should provide 2 or more cleaner-burning fuels and allow any motor vehicle that operates on such fuels to refuel at distances comfortably within 1 tank range without the need for prior arrangement. Existing and private facilities should be encouraged to be included in the Clean Vehicle Corridors network.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) CLEANER-BURNING FUELS.—The term ''cleaner-burning fuels'' includes—

(I) rapid-fueling compressed natural gas;

(II) liquefied natural gas;

(III) liquefied petroleum gas (also known as propane);

(IV) plug-in electric;

(V) biofuel;

(VI) hydrogen; and

(VII) other clean fuels designated by the Secretary.

(ii) SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''supporting infrastructure'' includes fueling stations, rest stops, travel plazas, and other service areas on Federal or private property that are found to be most practically located along a Clean Vehicle Corridor.

(3) INFORMATION AND RESOURCES ON CLEAN VEHICLE CORRIDORS.—

(A) WEBSITE.—The Secretary shall maintain a website containing information and resources for Clean Vehicle Corridors.

(B) INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—

(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—Two or more contiguous States may enter into an interstate compact to establish clean vehicle corridor partnerships to facilitate planning for and siting of necessary facilities within those States.

(ii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, may provide technical assistance to interstate compact partnerships established pursuant to clause (i).

SA 1990. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NATURAL GAS ENERGY AND ALTERNATIVES REBATE PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—The term ''alternative fuel'' means natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, hydrogen, electric, or fuel cell.

(2) ALTERNATIVELY FUELED BUS.—The term ''alternatively fueled bus'' means—

(A) a school bus (as defined in section 390.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations) that operates on alternative fuel;

(B) a multifunction school activity bus (as defined in section 571.3 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations) that operates on alternative fuel; or

(C) a motor vehicle that—

(i) provides public transportation (as defined in section 5302(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code); and

(ii) operates on alternative fuel.

(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term eligible entity means—

(A) a public or private entity providing transportation exclusively for school students, personnel, and equipment; or

(B) a public entity providing mass transit services to the public.

(b) REBATE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish the Natural Gas Energy and Alternatives Rebates Program (referred to in this section as the ''NGEAR Program'') to subsidize the purchase of alternatively fueled buses by eligible entities.

(2) AMOUNTS.—An eligible entity that purchases an alternatively fueled bus during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, is eligible to receive a rebate from the Department of Transportation under this subsection in an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) 30 percent of the purchase price of the alternatively fueled bus; or

(B) $15,000.

(3) APPLICATION.—Eligible entities desiring a rebate under the NGEAR Program shall submit an application to the Secretary of Transportation that contains copies of relevant sales invoices and any additional information that the Secretary of Transportation may require.

SA 1991. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. CLEAN ENERGY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means an entity described in subsection (c).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of Energy a program to provide grants to eligible entities, on a competitive basis, to develop and carry out clean energy and carbon reduction measures, such as—

(1) renewable electricity standards;

(2) regional or statewide climate action plans;

(3) the use of hybrid, electric, compressed natural gas, or fuel cell vehicles in State or local fleets;

(4) measures to increase the percentage of public buildings of the eligible entity that are certified with respect to standards for energy efficiency;

(5) participation in a regional greenhouse gas reduction program;

(6) facilitation of on-bill financing for energy efficiency improvements for residences and business served by rural coops;

(7) provision of State tax incentives for the manufacture or installation of clean energy components or energy efficiency upgrades;

(8) provision of innovative financing mechanisms to private sector entities to encourage the deployment of clean energy technologies;

(9) implementation of best management practices for the public utility commission of an eligible entity;

(10) improvement and updating of grid technology; and

(11) implementation of carbon efficiency standards.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State or unit of local government, or a regional consortium comprised of States or units of local governments, in partnership with private sector and nongovernmental organization partners, shall—

(1) meet any requirements established by the Secretary under subsection (f); and

(2) submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(d) AWARD.—The Secretary shall determine which eligible entities shall receive grants and the amount of the grants provided based on—

(1) the information provided in an application submitted under subsection (c)(2); and

(2) any criteria for reviewing and ranking applications developed by the Secretary by regulation under subsection (f).

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds provided under this section shall only be used for eligible uses specified by the Secretary by regulation under subsection (f).

(f) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations that establish criteria for grants under this section, including specifying the types of measures that are eligible for grants, establishing application criteria, and developing a point system to assist the Secretary in reviewing and ranking grant applications.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into account—

(A) regional disparities in the ways in which energy is produced and used; and

(B) the clean energy resource potential of the measures.

(g) EXPLANATION.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register an explanation of the manner by which grants awarded under subsection (d) would ensure an objective evaluation based on the criteria regulations promulgated under subsection (f)(1).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 2011 to carry out this section $5,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SA 1992. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SAVINGS OFFSET.

OMB shall reduce the total amount of deficit reduction required by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal year 2013 by an amount equal to the increase in revenues for fiscal year 2013 resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SA 1993. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulatory Relief to Reduce Energy Prices Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Americans are suffering through record levels of job losses, slow economic growth, high gasoline prices, and increasing energy costs, and unemployment in the United States is currently more than 8 percent;

(2) the President wrote in an August 2011 letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives that ''it is extremely important to minimize regulatory burdens and to avoid unjustified regulatory costs, particularly in this difficult economic period'' and, in that letter, the President identified at least 7 proposed regulations that would each impose billions of dollars in new costs on the private sector and, with respect to at least 1 of those rules, the President ultimately directed the Federal agency to not proceed with promulgation;

(3) the President stated in Executive Order 13563 that our Nation's regulatory system should ''protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation'';

(4) since the issuance of Executive Order 13563, additional significant Federal rules have been issued that increase energy costs and hinder economic growth;

(5) many existing Federal laws do not expressly authorize the President or the Federal agencies to delay or terminate the rulemaking process for new regulations based on adverse economic impacts, unemployment, energy prices and electric reliability, and other related considerations; and

(6) it is necessary for job creation, until the unemployment rate improves, to authorize the President to delay or disapprove any major rule due to concerns related to significant economic impacts.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act—

(1) is to facilitate economic growth, affordable energy, and job creation by providing

the President with authority to delay or disapprove the adoption, finalization, promulgation, issuance, or implementation of any major rule due to concerns related to significant economic impacts; and

(2) is not to authorize the President to delay or terminate rules that—

(A) facilitate economic recovery or job creation; or

(B) reduce the overall Federal regulatory burden.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''major rule'' has the meaning given that term under section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''significant economic impacts'' includes impacts on energy costs and electric reliability, gasoline prices, employment, gross domestic product, and related considerations.

SEC. 5. APPROVAL OF MAJOR RULES BY THE PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any major rule (as determined by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code) shall not become final and effective until the President issues an executive order of approval under subsection (b).

(b) EXECUTIVE ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After review of any major rule and consideration of significant economic impacts, the President may issue an executive order to—

(A) approve the major rule to become final and effective notwithstanding significant economic impacts;

(B) delay consideration of, or action upon, the major rule due to concerns related to significant economic impacts; or

(C) disapprove and terminate the major rule due to concerns related to significant economic impacts.

(2) CONTENTS.—Any executive order issued under paragraph (1) shall describe the basis for the finding of significant economic impacts and the rationale for the decision to approve, delay, or disapprove and terminate the major rule.

(c) EXEMPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—A major rule is exempt from this Act if the exemption is necessary in the interest of national security or in response to a national emergency.

SA 1994. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Truth in Energy Policy Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSPARENCY IN DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) TRANSPARENCY IN DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION.—The Secretary shall establish, and maintain with up-to-date data, a publicly available website listing the following:

''(1) The domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas.

''(2) The current demand for oil and natural gas in the United States.

''(3) Oil production from Federal property on an annual basis since 2000.

''(4) Oil production from non-Federal property on an annual basis since 2000.

''(5) The percent reduction or increase, measured on an annual basis, in oil and gas production from Federal property.

''(6) The number of Federal oil and gas leases issued annually since 2000.

''(7) A map showing Federal areas accessible to oil and gas production.

''(8) The total areas comprising the outer Continental Shelf and, of that acreage, the percentage that—

''(A) is actually leased for oil and gas production; and

''(B) would have been leased if the 2010–2015 offshore lease plan was fully implemented as proposed in 2008.

''(9) Total estimated United States oil resources.''.

SA 1995. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. DELAY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RULE REGARDING STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not promulgate or implement any final version of the proposed rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' (EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0660; FRL-RIN 2060 Aq91 (March 27, 2012)) until such time as the standards proposed in that rule are implemented by Russia, China, and India.

SA 1996. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, strike lines 4 and 5 and insert the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EFFECT OF NEPA ON CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall assess and produce a report on how the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) affects—

(1) the Department of Defense;

(2) the Department of Energy;

(3) the Department of the Interior;

(4) the Department of Transportation;

(5) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(6) the Corps of Engineers; and

(7) the Forest Service.

(b) CONTENTS.—For each Federal agency described in subsection (a), the report shall include an assessment of—

(1) the cost of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(2) the quantity of man hours spent on complying with that Act;

(3) the quantity of litigation the Federal agency engages in as a result of that Act, including the quantity of time and the cost that litigation adds to a project; and

(4) the economic costs associated with the delay in onshore and offshore oil and gas production as a result of that Act.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 401. DEFICIT REDUCTION.

SA 1997. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Domestic Energy Advancement and Leasing Act''.

SEC. 2. COMMERCIAL LEASING PROGRAM FOR OIL SHALE RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LAND.

Subsection (e) of the Oil Shale, Tar Sands, and Other Strategic Unconventional Fuels Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15927(e)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''Not later'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later'';

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''If the Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(2) LEASE SALES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall'';

(3) in the last sentence, by striking ''Evidence of interest'' and inserting the following:

''(B) EVIDENCE OF INTEREST.—Evidence of interest''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) SUBSEQUENT LEASE SALES.—During any period for which the Secretary determines that there is sufficient support and interest in a State in the development of tar sands and oil shale resources, the Secretary shall—

''(i) at least annually, consult with the persons described in paragraph (1) to expedite the commercial leasing program for oil shale resources on public land in the State; and

''(ii) at least once every 270 days, conduct a lease sale in the State under the commercial leasing program regulations.''.

SEC. 3. JURISDICTION OVER COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED ENERGY PROJECT.—In this section, the term ''covered energy project'' means any action or decision by a Federal official regarding—

(1) the leasing of Federal land (including submerged land) for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, or any other source or form of energy, including actions and decisions regarding the selection or offering of Federal land for such leasing; or

(2) any action under such a lease, except that this section and Act shall not apply to a dispute between the parties to a lease entered into a provision of law authorizing the lease regarding obligations under the lease or the alleged breach of the lease.

(b) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OVER CAUSES AND CLAIMS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear all causes and claims under this section or any other Act that arise from any covered energy project.

(c) TIME FOR FILING COMPLAINT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each case or claim described in subsection (b) shall be filed not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the action or decision by

a Federal official that constitutes the covered energy project concerned.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Any cause or claim described in subsection (b) that is not filed within the time period described in paragraph (1) shall be barred.

(d) DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEADLINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each proceeding that is subject to subsection (b) shall—

(A) be resolved as expeditiously as practicable and in any event not more than 180 days after the cause or claim is filed; and

(B) take precedence over all other pending matters before the district court.

(2) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DEADLINE.—If an interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order has not been issued by the district court by the deadline required under this section, the cause or claim shall be dismissed with prejudice and all rights relating to the cause or claim shall be terminated.

(e) ABILITY TO SEEK APPELLATE REVIEW.—An interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order of the district court under this section may be reviewed by no other court except the Supreme Court.

(f) DEADLINE FOR APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT.—If a writ of certiorari has been granted by the Supreme Court pursuant to subsection (e), the interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order of the district court shall be resolved as expeditiously as practicable and in any event not more than 180 days after the interlocutory or final judgment, decree, order of the district court is issued.

SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.

Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 106. COMPLETION AND REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.

"(a) COMPLETION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each review carried out under section 102(2)(C) with respect to any action taken under any provision of law, or for which funds are made available under any provision of law, shall be completed not later than the date that is 270 days after the commencement of the review.

"(2) FAILURE TO COMPLETE REVIEW.—If a review described in paragraph (1) has not been completed for an action subject to section 102(2)(C) by the date specified in paragraph (1)—

"(A) the action shall be considered to have no significant impact described in section 102(2)(C); and

"(B) that classification shall be considered to be a final agency action.

"(3) UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—If the national unemployment rate is 5 percent or more, the lead agency conducting a review of an action under this section shall use the most expeditious means authorized under this title to conduct the review.

"(b) LEAD AGENCY.—The lead agency for a review of an action under this section shall be the Federal agency to which funds are made available for the action.

"(c) REVIEW.—

"(1) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—There shall be a single administrative appeal for each review carried out pursuant to section 102(2)(C).

"(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—On resolution of the administrative appeal, judicial review of the final agency decision after exhaustion of administrative remedies shall lie with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

"(B) ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.—An appeal to the court described in subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the administrative record.

"(C) PENDENCY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—After an agency has made a final decision with respect to a review carried out under this subsection, the decision shall be effective during the course of any subsequent appeal to a court described in subparagraph (A).

"(3) CIVIL ACTION.—Each civil action covered by this section shall be considered to arise under the laws of the United States.".

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on the first day after the date of enactment of this Act on which occurs any sale from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve established under part B of title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6231 et seq.).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. 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 28, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "The Science and Standards of Forensics."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, "High Stakes and Hard Choices: U.S. Policy on Iran."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 28, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Hearing on the Special Counsel's Report on the Prosecution of Senator Ted Stevens."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 28, 2012, at 3 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, in room 418 of the Senate Russell Office Building, beginning at 9:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs' Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Retirement (In) Security: Examining the Retirement Savings Deficit."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, FEDERAL SERVICES, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Federal Financial Managment, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Assessing Efforts to Combat Waste and Fraud in Federal Programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 28, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Melissa Laine and Michael Johnson, fellows in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 112th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2012 first quarter Mass Mailing report is Wednesday, April 25, 2012. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records will be open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS AND SONS TO WORK DAY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 408, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 408) supporting the goals and ideals of Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 408) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 408

Whereas the Take Our Daughters To Work Day program was created in New York City as a response to research that showed that, by the 8th grade, many girls were dropping out of school, had low self-esteem, and lacked confidence;

Whereas, in 2003, the name of the program was changed to ''Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day'' so that boys who face many of the same challenges as girls could also be involved in the program;

Whereas the mission of the program, to develop ''innovative strategies that empower girls and boys to overcome societal barriers to reach their full potential'', now fully reflects the addition of boys;

Whereas the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Foundation, a nonprofit organization, has grown to become one of the largest public awareness campaigns, with more than 37,000,000 participants annually in more than 3,000,000 organizations and workplaces in every State;

Whereas, in 2007, the Take Our Daughters To Work program transitioned to Elizabeth City, North Carolina, became known as the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Foundation, and received national recognition for the dedication of the Foundation to future generations;

Whereas every year, mayors, governors, and other private and public officials sign proclamations and lend their support to Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work;

Whereas the fame of the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work program has spread overseas, with requests and inquiries being made from around the world on how to operate the program;

Whereas 2012 marks the 20th anniversary of the Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work program;

Whereas Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day will be observed on Thursday, April 26, 2012; and

Whereas Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work is intended to continue helping millions of girls and boys on an annual basis through experienced activities and events to examine their opportunities and strive to reach their fullest potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the goals of introducing our daughters and sons to the workplace; and

(2) commends all the participants in Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the vital role the participants play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the United States.

FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 409, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 409) designating April 2012 as ''Financial Literacy Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 409) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 409

Whereas according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, at least 25.6 percent of households in the United States, or close to 30,000,000 households with approximately 60,000,000 adults, are unbanked or underbanked and, subsequently, have missed opportunities for savings, lending, and basic financial services;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 41 percent of adults in the United States, or more than 77,000,000 adults living in the United States, gave themselves a grade of C, D, or F on their knowledge of personal finance;

Whereas according to the National Bankruptcy Research Center, the number of personal bankruptcy filings reached 1,500,000 in 2010, the highest number since 2005, and in 2011, the percentage of total consumer filings increased from 2010;

Whereas the 2011 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that only 13 percent of workers were ''very confident'' about having enough money for a comfortable retirement, a sharp decline in worker confidence from the 27 percent of workers who were ''very confident'' in 2007;

Whereas according to the 2011 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute, less than half of workers (42 percent) in the United States have tried to calculate how much they need to save for retirement;

Whereas according to a 2011 ''Flow of Funds'' report by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, household debt stood at $13,200,000,000,000 at the end of the third quarter of 2010;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 28 percent, or nearly 64,000,000 adults, admit to not paying all of their bills on time;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, only 43 percent of adults keep close track of their spending, and more than 128,400,000 adults do not know how much they spend on food, housing, and entertainment, and do not monitor their overall spending;

Whereas according to the 2011 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, 1 in 3 adults in the United States, or more than 75,600,000 individuals, report that they have no savings, and only 22 percent of adults in the United States are now saving more than they did a year ago because of the current economic climate;

Whereas according to the seventh Council for Economic Education biennial Survey of the States 2011: Economic, Personal Finance, and Entrepreneurship Education in Our Nation's Schools, only 22 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement, and only 16 States require the testing of student knowledge in economics;

Whereas according to the seventh Council for Economic Education biennial Survey of the States 2011: Economic, Personal Finance, and Entrepreneurship Education in Our Nation's Schools, only 12 States require students to take a personal finance course either independently or as part of an economics course as a high school graduation requirement;

Whereas according to the Gallup-Operation HOPE Financial Literacy Index, while 69 percent of American students strongly believe that the best time to save money is now, only 57 percent believe that their parents are saving money for the future;

Whereas expanding access to the mainstream financial system will provide individuals with less expensive and more secure options for managing finances and building wealth;

Whereas quality personal financial education is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and to become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas increased financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion caused by an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas, in 2003, Congress found it important to coordinate Federal financial literacy efforts and formulate a national strategy; and

Whereas, in light of that finding, Congress passed the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.), establishing the Financial Literacy and Education Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2012 as ''Financial Literacy Month'' to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2012

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until Thursday, March 29, at 9:30 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2230, the Paying A Fair Share Act, with the time until 11:30 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes; further, that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 2204, the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act, be 10:30 a.m. on Thursday; and that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2204.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am informed that the first vote tomorrow will be at approximately 11:30 in the morning on the motion to invoke cloture on the Repeal Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act. The Transportation bill expires at the end of the month. That will also have to be addressed before we leave this week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 29, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

ROBERT JAMES GREY, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

JOHN GERSON LEVI, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

LAURIE I. MIKVA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2013. (REAPPOINTMENT)

MARTHA L. MINOW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

GLORIA VALENCIA—WEBER, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 28, 2012:

THE JUDICIARY

MIRANDA DU, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA.

SUSIE MORGAN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO GPO ACCESS

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 16, 2012, the U.S. Government Printing Office, GPO, officially retired GPO Access, GPO's online repository of federal government documents since 1994. GPO has completed the transition from GPO Access to its successor, GPO's Federal Digital System, FDsys, which was first launched in 2009 and became GPO's official system of record in December 2010.

GPO Access was established pursuant to Public Law 103–40, Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993. In President Clinton's statement upon signing the Act on June 8, 1993, he remarked:

> It is with great pleasure that I sign into law S. 564, the "Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993," which will enhance electronic access by the public to Federal information. Under this Act, the public will have on-line computer access to two of the major source documents that inform us about the laws and regulations that affect our daily lives: the Congressional Record and the Federal Register . . .
>
> This important step forward in the electronic dissemination of Federal information will provide valuable insights into the most effective means of disseminating all public Government information . . .

Upon its release, GPO Access ushered in an era of unprecedented access to Federal government information. Never before had American citizens from one end of this great country to the other been able to access the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Federal Register, bills and resolutions, and a host of other Federal government publications literally hours after their release. GPO Access marked a quiet revolution in government transparency on the same scale as C–SPAN. With hundreds of thousands of Federal government titles posted online and millions of downloads every month, GPO truly embodied the spirit of the Thomas Jefferson quotation: "wherever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government" and the James Madison quotation: "A popular Government without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy, or perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." However, even our Founding Fathers could never have imagined the era of access to government information which we have come to enjoy since the advent of GPO Access, and the story only gets better.

GPO's FDsys, www.fdsys.gov, provides the American public with free online access to about 50 different collections of authenticated U.S. Government information ranging from public and private laws to U.S. court opinions to the President's annual budget. It allows users to search easily across multiple government publications; perform advanced searches against robust metadata about each publication; construct complex search queries; refine and narrow searches; access metadata in standard XML formats; download content and metadata packaged together as a single ZIP file; and browse alphabetically by collection, by congressional committee, by date, and by government author.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the hard-working men and women of GPO on their remarkable achievement with GPO Access. I look forward to GPO's continuing contribution to "Keeping America Informed" through its successor, FDsys.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN V. SULLIVAN, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN, UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker thanks to Mr. DREIER, Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. DINGELL for organizing this special order in recognition of John Sullivan, the House's Parliamentarian since 2004, and Deputy or Assistant Parliamentarian since 1987.

For these 25 years, John has been a familiar face on the floor of the House of Representatives, helping presiding officers maintain order and the flow of business. He has done his work with reassuring steadiness and competence, impartiality and fairness, even when tempers were flaring and ingenious, sometimes disingenuous, arguments were flying all around him.

John and the parliamentary staff he oversees have also been invaluable sources of advice and counsel for this institution's members, officers, and committees. Their institutional memory—both in their personal capacity and in the reference and retrieval system they have developed—is beyond compare. John perfected his own skills under illustrious predecessors—Charles Johnson and Bill Brown—and has administered and advanced the office superbly. This institution is currently facing serious strains and challenges. But in the area of parliamentary experience and control, we are operating from a position of great strength, thanks to the work of John and his colleagues.

John Sullivan's work is enhanced by his historical and comparative parliamentary knowledge, and I want especially to commend him for his willingness to share that knowledge with our colleagues in parliaments with which we cooperate around the world. I particularly remember his participation with the House Democracy Partnership in a mission to two partner legislatures, Liberia and Kenya, in 2010. He engaged enthusiastically and helpfully with these parliaments as they developed their own parliamentary rules and standards under trying conditions. John has done this repeatedly, meeting countless times with visiting parliamentary and staff delegations and generously extending his counsel and encouragement.

In short, John Sullivan has been an exemplary public servant and an invaluable resource for this institution and our sister institutions around the world. I am happy to join with colleagues in thanking him for his service and wishing him well in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ELEANOR K. ANDREWS, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Today I pay tribute to Eleanor K. Andrews, an extraordinary woman of California's 29th Congressional District. As a resident of the city of San Gabriel, California, for over 50 years, Eleanor has always strived to make the city a better place.

Earlier in her career, Eleanor served on the Board of Trustees of the San Gabriel School District for 10 years. In addition, she was very active with the San Gabriel Valley YMCA, where she served as Vice President.

Today, Eleanor continues to serve the community she calls home. Currently, Ms. Andrews, who is the San Gabriel City Clerk, tirelessly volunteers in many organizations. Eleanor is the Co-Chair of the Senior Christmas Basket Program, where she dedicates her time to doing all the grocery shopping, and knitting over 60 pairs of slippers to put in all the baskets every year. In addition, she is a member and Past President of the Women's Division of the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce, member and Treasurer of the San Gabriel Community Coordinating Council, serves on the Executive Committee and as Research Chairwoman of the 2013 San Gabriel Centennial Committee, and serves on the Board of the San Gabriel Historical Association, where she was the Association's Past President, and now serves as the Recording Secretary.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an outstanding woman of my district, Eleanor K. Andrews, for her exceptional service to the community.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR FAMILY LITERACY'S TOYOTA TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARDED TO SHARI BROWN

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Shari Brown for receiving the 2012 Toyota Teacher of the Year Award. This award, presented by the National Center for Family Literacy, annually recognizes an educator in a program that has a strong record of increasing meaningful parent engagement and family learning.

Shari is a family literacy coordinator and instructor at Caldwell Community College serving Lenoir and other cities and towns in my congressional district. The program, which serves approximately 50 families each year and has another 30 on the waiting list, has a strong record of success. Children in the program tend to enter school six to eighteen months more advanced than average, and children for whom English is a second language enter kindergarten at the same, if not at a higher level, than their non-ESL peers, requiring no accommodations. Furthermore, adult students have a 94% persistence rate, and numerous ESL students move from the lowest levels of ESL to graduation with a GED and enter college.

Shari will use the $20,000 grant that comes with the award to create a local community garden project where families will learn to grow, harvest and preserve their own food. Families will also participate in local farmer's markets, preparing nutritious meals utilizing the food they grow, supplemented with surplus commodities. Furthermore, they will study good nutrition and how to combat obesity in their family members. Lastly, families will have the opportunity to learn about culinary and horticultural career choices. Both of these industries have been identified as high-growth employment areas in Caldwell County, North Carolina.

Shari's recognition through this award is to be commended. Ms. Brown works every day to help families become self-sufficient and better able to help their children learn and grow academically in school. Thank you to the National Center for Family Literacy for recognizing one of our great community assets in Caldwell County.

COMMENDATION OF INDIAN VILLAGE TENNIS CLUB

HON. HANSEN CLARKE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Indian Village Tennis Club's 100th anniversary on April 16, 2012. The Indian Village Tennis Club is a rich part of Detroit's history.

The Indian Village Tennis Club has owned its property since 1894, and began using the tennis courts and clubhouse on April 16, 1912. The Indian Village Tennis Club is located in Detroit's historic Indian Village neighborhood, and is the oldest tennis club in the United States to remain at its original site.

Club members enjoy the clay tennis courts, clubhouse, and perennial garden from May to October. The club has hosted numerous tournaments, lessons with tennis professionals, and social events promoting healthy living and wellness. Club members are active in the community.

It is with honor that I recognize the Indian Village Tennis Club for being a valuable organization in the Metro Detroit community for 100 years.

I am proud to have such a distinguished club in my community and I look forward to its continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE MULTILATERAL BENEFITS OF GLOBAL HEALTH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. DAVID SCOTT
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, to ensure our nation's competitiveness in the global arena and spur business development and expansion, it is clearly in our nation's interest to ensure robust federal funding for global health research. We are an innovation economy, and the basic research that federal funding makes possible sews the seeds for the later stage and private sector discoveries that attract philanthropic and venture capital dollars. And global health research is a priority for the American people. According to a May 2011 poll commissioned by Research!America, 74% of Georgians say that global health research is important to the economy.

As we consider federal funding for medical research, it is important to keep in mind that investment in global health research brings a rich return to the United States.

Throughout the United States, investment in global health leads to industry. In my home state of Georgia, successful start-ups like Geovax are breaking new ground in global HIV/AIDS research. Funding from the National Institutes of Health helped Geovax get off the ground, and now it is an employer that contributes to Georgia's economy and to improving global health. With global health powerhouses including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, The Task Force for Global Health, The Carter Center, and CARE all based in Georgia, along with the world class scientists within our university system, Georgia is positioned to become a world leader for global health.

In this age of globalization, when intercontinental travel is a daily occurrence for thousands of people worldwide, treating communicable diseases in other countries is a must for preventing their widespread occurrence here in the United States. We have witnessed several times this past decade how easily diseases travel, as evidenced by the quick spread of SARS, avian flu and pandemic H1N1 flu from other countries to the western world. The spread of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR TB) is also of great concern, as infected individuals can be asymptomatic for years and still transmit the disease. Currently, infectious diseases cost the U.S. $120 billion a year. By funding global health research programs dedicated to the prevention and eradication of communicable diseases in emerging economies, the United States is investing in its own immediate and long-term health, and saving on health care costs for treatment.

The landmark government initiative PEPFAR (U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief), is showing strong returns. Publicly funded researchers have identified and designed a multitude of preventive measures that reduce the risk of HIV transmission. Recent clinical trials demonstrated that combination antiretroviral treatments (developed by U.S. based pharmaceutical companies) can reduce the risk of HIV transmission by up to 96%. Deploying preventive measures in some of the highest risk countries around the world will certainly help reduce the spread of HIV. These measures will also help reduce the spread of HIV in the United States, where approximately 40,000 people per year are diagnosed, costing the U.S. a projected $12.1 billion in lifetime medical expenses.

Investment in global health research and development today will help produce a healthy, competitive and innovative economy tomorrow. At the same time, such research helps to protect Americans, reduce health care costs and meet our nation's foreign policy goals. And investing in global research is a means of saving lives and preventing disability in impoverished nations—it is an immensely powerful form of humanitarianism that can help millions of people throughout the world now and in the future. As we map out strategies for promoting the U.S. economy, we must not falter in our investment in medical research that surely includes research devoted to combating global illnesses. We must capitalize on opportunities for NIH, CDC, FDA, USAID and DOD to support global health research—for the benefit of Americans and the global community of which we are a part.

RECOGNIZING THE 450TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRENCH HUGUENOT CAPTAIN JEAN RIBAULT'S LANDING IN FLORIDA

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Sesquiquadricentennial, or 450th anniversary, of the French expedition commanded by Huguenot Captain Jean Ribault landing in Florida at what is now Jacksonville, my hometown. Seeking the right to worship freely and with the support of the French Crown, Ribault sailed toward the New World and dropped anchor along the North Florida coast. His arrival on April 30, 1562, marked the beginning of French history in Florida.

The next day, May 1, the crew sailed north and came to "a leaping and breking of the water, as a streme falling owt of the lande unto the sea." They had discovered the mouth of a majestic river that Ribault named the River of Maye. We now call that river the St. Johns River, but the Village of Mayport and Naval Station Mayport owe their names to the original River of May.

Greeted by indigenous, Mocama-speaking Timucua Indians, Ribault and his crew entered the river, rowed ashore, and planted a column in honor of their King, Charles IX, claiming the land for France and marking a spot for future settlement. This French landing predates the settling of Jamestown by 45 years and occurred 58 years before the Mayflower arrived in Plymouth.

Two years later on June 22, 1564, a second sailing expedition, under the command of Rene Goulaine de Laudonniere, established the first French colony in the present-day United States of America near the mouth of the river. It was named la Caroline for the French King Charles IX. A fort was built in the colony or land of Charles to protect settlers. While there undoubtedly will be continued debate as to where and who claimed the first celebration of thanksgiving, we do know that the French Huguenots of the la Caroline colony celebrated a day of thanksgiving on June 30, 1564, and shared a meal with the Timucua Indians. Today, this landmark is operated by the United States National Park Service as Fort Caroline National Memorial.

Beginning with this first settlement and continuing until today, France and Florida have built a long-lasting relationship through consular representations, trade, cultural and educational exchanges, and tourism, all of which benefit both the French people and the people of Florida.

Florida has a long, rich maritime history dating back at least 12,000 years, but the documented history of the French coming to this long, flat peninsula is also cause for celebration. Many exciting activities are planned including the rededication of the Ribault Monument at Ft. Caroline National Memorial and the French Navy mooring two goelettes, the Etoile and the Belle Poule, in downtown Jacksonville. Consul General of France in Miami, Gaël de Maisonneuve, and other French and American dignitaries will be on hand for this historical celebration.

It is my honor to bring this historic commemoration to the attention of the United States Congress and to invite Members to join in the celebration.

ANGELICA PRADO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angelica Prado for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Angelica Prado is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angelica Prado 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 Angelica Prado 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 her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained I was unable to cast the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote 132—I would have voted "yes," rollcall vote 134—I would have voted "no," rollcall vote 135—I would have voted "no," rollcall vote 136—I would have voted "no," rollcall vote 137—I would have voted "no," rollcall vote 138—I would have voted "yes."

WELCOME HOME VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. XXX, expressing support for "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans' Day 2012."

We do not have to walk far from the doors of this building to be reminded of the bravery that so many of our young men and women have shown in defense of this country over the last 236 years. Statues, monuments, and other symbols of American freedom color our horizon and tell the stories of the veterans who served, sacrificed, and gave so much for the country they loved.

As a nation, we honor those who defend us with memorials, holidays, and parades. But, as a people, we have not always fulfilled our duty to properly recognize those fellow citizens who put themselves in harm's way to keep us safe and protect our freedoms.

Unfortunately, we failed in this duty to our Vietnam veterans. They came home to a time of civil unrest and social turmoil—a time when opposition to the war too easily turned into opposition against those young men and women who served in that war.

Too many service members returned from the brutality of war, not recognized for their courage, their honor, and their sacrifice.

The harsh greeting that met too many veterans in addition to the life changing trials of war, made an already difficult transition to civilian life even harder.

The communities that could have supported those who were reeling from the trauma of loss were not always available. When these veterans needed someone to lend an ear, or a helping hand, too many found a cold shoulder.

By encouraging Americans to observe "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day," my resolution seeks to provide these heroes the welcome home that they always deserved, but too many never received.

"Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day" is the culmination of years of effort on the part of my constituent Jose Ramos, himself a Vietnam veteran.

As an Army Combat Medic in Vietnam, Jose Ramos was victim to the indifferent and often hostile public reaction when he returned home. It was his personal experiences, and those of his fellow GIs, that motivated him to work toward establishing a national day of recognition. His work inspired many, including me, to help give Vietnam veterans their long overdue "welcome home."

While today's resolution may seem like a small gesture—and when compared to what our soldiers and their families sacrificed, it certainly is—it will serve to remind us of their service to our country.

Although there may be differing opinions on foreign policies and the popularity of certain military actions may vary, all American voices should rise in unison when it comes time to thank those who risk everything for the defense of the American people.

I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to join in honoring Vietnam veterans by participating in Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day events in their communities next year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTIN HEINRICH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of March 26, 2012, I unfortunately missed rollcall votes 127, 128, and 129.

If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall vote 127, Representative STIVER's (OH–15) bill, H.R. 2779.

If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall vote 128, Representative GRIMM's (NY–13) H.R. 2682.

If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall vote 129, approval of the journal.

CANDIDATE VS. PRESIDENT ON OBAMACARE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent CBS News article, when the President in 2008 was on the campaign trail, he blasted his primary opponent, Hillary Clinton, for supporting an individual mandate. Less than two years later, however, when the President lobbied the liberal-controlled Congress to pass the government healthcare takeover bill, he told legislators the individual mandate "was an essential part" of the takeover.

Almost every poll conducted across this country reveals the same result: an overwhelming number of Americans believe the individual mandate found in ObamaCare is unconstitutional and a chipping away of individual liberty. The Gadsden Flag of South Carolina is correct: Don't Tread on Me.

The United States government should not require all of its citizens to buy insurance or push any other mandates that will limit freedoms. It is past the time for our nation to support legislation for real healthcare reform as developed by Congressman TOM PRICE that will guarantee these rights every American deserves.

In conclusion, God Bless our troops and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

ANGEL HAZLETT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angel Hazlett for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Angel Hazlett is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angel Hazlett 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 Angel Hazlett 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 her future accomplishments.

A TRIBUTE TO GRETCHEN ROBINETTE, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Today, I pay tribute to Gretchen Robinette, a tireless volunteer, advocate, and remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District. Born and raised in South Pasadena, California, Gretchen graduated from South Pasadena High School, attained a B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley, and a Master's degree from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Gretchen served in the Peace Corps as an English language teacher in Malaysian Borneo for two years, along with her husband, Vic Robinette. Ms. Robinette was a teacher and librarian throughout most of her professional career for South Pasadena High School, Rio Hondo College in Whittier, and San Luis Obispo High School. Her commitment to education is also reflected through her willingness to be involved in school issues. She assisted in bringing the South Pasadena High School Library online, contributed her time to help design the school's library when it was constructed, and served in the Academic Senate at Rio Hondo College. Upon her retirement from teaching a decade ago, Gretchen joined her husband's CPA firm, where she holds the position of Office Manager.

Ms. Robinette has also served the community beyond the realm of education; a fact that she attributes to her years of service in the Peace Corps. She serves on the Board of Directors for the South Pasadena Preservation Foundation, chairs the South Pasadena Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs Committee, in addition to serving as a Chamber of Commerce Ambassador. A co-founder and former president, she currently serves as a Board Member for Women Involved in South Pasadena Political Action, WISPPA, an organization that works to improve integrity, accountability and transparency in the city government of South Pasadena. Past volunteer activities include serving on the South Pasadena Public Library's Board of Trustees and the Board of South Pasadena Beautiful.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an outstanding woman of the 29th Congressional District, Gretchen Robinette, for her extraordinary service to the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF WISCONSIN COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC. (WCS) 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to honor Wisconsin Community Services, Inc. for 100 years of service in the great State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin Community Services, Inc., or WCS, was founded in 1912 as the "Society for the Friendless" and is the largest and oldest nonprofit criminal justice organization in the State of Wisconsin.

WCS' original mission has remained constant from its inception to present day: to assist people who were incarcerated; to assist the families left behind; and "to advocate for justice and community safety by providing innovative opportunities for individuals to overcome adversity." During its 100-year history, WCS has helped to increase public safety and strengthen communities by giving disenfranchised residents the tools and support they need to be healthy, law-abiding, and productive.

I applaud WCS for offering alternatives that have resulted in lower recidivism rates compared to incarceration, thereby providing significant savings to taxpayers. The organization takes every opportunity to provide both innovative and evidence-based programming in a variety of service areas including the following: residential re-entry and workforce development; court services; services to persons with alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA); services to those with mental health or co-occurring disorders; and services for youth. In 2011 alone, WCS has served more than 15,000 individuals.

Mr. Speaker, WCS agency has made a tremendous impact and left its imprint on the historic, cultural, and civic life of the people of Wisconsin. I am proud that WCS is located in the 4th Congressional District providing support services and tools to help people successfully reintegrate into the community. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting WCS in recognition of 100 years of advocating for justice and community safety by providing innovative opportunities for individuals to overcome adversity.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, women are just over 50 percent of the U.S. population, but we bear much more than half of the Nation's health care costs.

In so many ways, the American health care system has been geared toward men, men's bodies and men's needs. As women we've had to fight and struggle for parity, and finally the Affordable Care Act has given us that level playing field.

So naturally, my friends in the majority want to scrap this law that has helped so many women obtain life-saving preventive care services. They couldn't repeal it through the democratic process, so now they're trying to get the Supreme Court to do it.

We must say no. No, we will not tolerate discrimination in the health care system. No, being woman is not a pre-existing condition.

ANDREA BLANCAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Andrea Blancas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Andrea Blancas is a 12th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Andrea Blancas 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 Andrea Blancas 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 her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 134, 135, 136; had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT BILLINGSLEA

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful corporate and community leader upon his retirement. Robert Billingslea is retiring on March 31, 2012 as the Corporate Director of Urban Affairs for the Walt Disney Company. His professional efforts have enhanced the strength and diversity of the Disney Company, and his civic endeavors have made a tremendous impact on the city of Orlando.

Robert Lee Billingslea was born on December 20, 1937, to Faye and Robert Billingslea. He was raised by his grandparents on the south side of Youngstown, Ohio. Growing up he attended local public schools, and found his passion in music. He began playing the drums at age 12, and at 16 he was playing professionally. In 1956 he graduated from South High School, and was voted ''most musical'' in his class. His love of music spurred him to move to California following graduation to pursue a career as a musician. He studied music at Vallejo Junior College, while performing with several West Coast bands.

In 1958, he returned to his hometown and continued to tour the country playing drums for various musical groups. Two years later, he enrolled in Kent State University to study sociology. In his senior year, he worked in juvenile court, and upon graduation became a probation officer in Akron, Ohio's juvenile court system. Mr. Billingslea went on to serve as a community organizer for the Office of Economic Opportunity. In 1966, an opportunity to become a wage and salary compensation analyst at Martin Marietta Corporation (now Lockheed Martin) took his life on a new trajectory in Orlando, Florida.

He joined the Walt Disney Company in 1969, and went to work at Disneyland in California as a senior personnel representative. But he quickly returned to Orlando where he was involved in the opening of the new Disney World facility in 1971. He has remained with Disney since that time, climbing the ladder to his current position as Corporate Director of Urban Affairs.

In addition to his position at Disney, Mr. Billingslea has been just as active in his community. When he returned to Orlando, he became chair of the Orlando Human Relations Board. Four governors also appointed him to serve on the Florida State Commission on Human Relations. It was during this time that our paths crossed and we became fast friends.

In 1985, his work at Disney brought him together with the NAACP, which was reviewing the company's employment practices for African Americans. Mr. Billingslea served as Disney's liaison to the NAACP, and a lasting relationship formed. He began working with the NAACP's Youth initiative, Academic, Cultural, Technological and Scientific Olympics (ACT–SO). Through this program, he helped African American youth enhance their academic, artistic and scientific abilities. He served on the ACT–SO Industry Advisory Council, as a Special Contributions Fund Trustee, and on the NAACP Image Awards Committee.

His experiences working with youth in the juvenile court system ignited a lifelong passion. He serves as an ambassador to the Boys & Girls Club of Central Florida, as a trustee for Bethune-Cookman University, and as an advisor to the Central Florida Urban League. He is also a member of the board for the League of Black Women and the Florida Endowment Foundation for Vocational Rehabilitation.

Bob has been honored with numerous awards include the National Service to Youth Award from the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for his 30 years of dedicated service and the Whitney M. Young Award from the Metropolitan Orlando Urban League in recognition of his help in founding and supporting the local Urban League chapter.

Mr. Billingslea and his wife Deidre (DeeDee) live in Orlando, and are the parents of one son. They are also the proud grandparents of two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me today in celebrating the extraordinary contributions of Robert Billingslea. This a man who came from humble beginnings who started out hoping to change the world with his music, but ended up beating a different drum. He has helped shape the Walt Disney Company into the beloved entertainment empire it is today and still found time to help build a better community in Central Florida. I wish him well in his retirement, and know that he will continue to share his time and talents with others.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. KAY MOURADIAN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

I stand today to pay tribute to Kay Mouradian, EdD, of South Pasadena, California, who has provided the Los Angeles Community Colleges with strong leadership and dedication for many years. Attaining a B.S. from Boston University, an M.S. from University of California, Los Angeles, and an Ed.D. from Nova Southeastern University, Dr. Mouradian served the Los Angeles Community Colleges as Professor of Health and Physical Education, and advocated in the California Teachers Association for the importance of physical education in California Community Colleges. In addition to her love of education and advocacy for health, Dr. Mouradian is also a very accomplished author.

Dr. Mouradian researched yoga in India for several months for her dissertation. She has published articles about yoga for magazines, with two much admired articles titled: Increasing Body Awareness through Yoga's Relaxation Technique and Developing a Competency-based Syllabus in Yoga for the Community College Curriculum. Kay's efforts did not stop there, as she also published a guide for yoga instructors who taught at the community colleges. In addition, Dr. Mouradian is planning to write books tailored to help people who want to and are interested in retaining a quality body, primarily during their elder years.

After several health crises, Kay's mother asked her to write about her life. This opened a new chapter for Kay. Kay extensively researched the Armenian Genocide of 1915 by reading numerous books and traveling to Turkey. There, she visited the town where 25,000 Armenians, including her mother and her family, were ordered to leave their homes at the time of the Armenian Genocide. She journeyed through the deportation path, where over 2,000,000 Turkish Armenians had to march for countless miles through the desert. Her findings and experience led her to write A Gift in the Sunlight, An Armenian Story.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Dr. Kay Mouradian, for her exceptional service to the community.

ANASTASIA LAWRENCE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anastasia Lawrence for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Anastasia Lawrence is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anastasia Lawrence 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 Anastasia Lawrence 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 her future accomplishments.

STUDENT LOAN GRACE PERIOD EXTENSION ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this recession has left virtually no one untouched. Students that are graduating from college are finding not only a hostile job market, but many carry with them an overwhelming amount of debt. If we are going to get our economy back on track, we need to make sure those young people are given a fighting chance.

The unemployment rate for new college graduates in many fields is higher than the national average and they currently have to begin repayment on their loans a short 6 months after they graduate. The class of 2010 faced an unemployment rate for new college graduates of 9.1 percent, the highest in recent years.

That is why I am introducing the "Student Loan Grace Period Extension Act" which will extend the grace period for Federal Subsidized and Federal Unsubsidized Student Loans from 6 months to 12 months after the student graduates. This bill will provide students with a necessary window after graduation where they can conduct their job search without the financial constraint of monthly student loan payments after 6 short months. Given the recent recession and our slow economic recovery, it only makes sense to give those young people just entering the work force a fighting chance to find a job and start earning before they begin repaying their loan obligations.

By passing this bill, we will ensure that our college graduates are not prematurely burdened with student loan payments before many of them may be able to find gainful employment in their field.

HONORING HELEN AGUIRRE FERRÉ

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I rise to honor one of South Florida's finest award-winning, bilingual journalists, Helen Aguirre Ferré. Having profound experience in journalism, she dominates various media platforms including, TV, radio, and print media.

Having more than two decades of experience, Mrs. Aguirre Ferré currently serves as the Opinion Page Editor for El Diario Las America. Her father, Horacio Aguirre, an exceptional leader in South Florida, founded El Diario, Florida's oldest independent Spanish-language newspaper. For more than half a century, El Diario has maintained a high level of intellect, professionalism, and integrity. Mrs. Aguirre Ferré is also a political guest analyst for Univision, where she frequently appears on "Despierta America" and "Al Punto." She also co-hosts Univision's "Prohibido Callarse," a highly rated daily political talk show, and moderates the weekly public-affairs series Issues for WPBT2, a South Florida PBS station.

Her accomplishments go beyond her professional career; Mrs. Aguirre Ferré co-founded Operation Saving Lives, a humanitarian effort responsible for sending money, medicines, food, and clothing to hurricane victims in Central America. She is the first woman to chair Miami Dade College's Board of Trustees and she serves on the Board of Directors of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Additionally, Mrs. Aguirre Ferré is a member of the International Women's Forum, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Inter-American Institute for Democracy, the New Hampshire Institute of Politics, Mercy Hospital's Angels of Mercy, the Mater Center, and the American Nicaraguan Foundation.

She has received numerous awards from various organizations, including the Cuban American National Council, Barry University, Saint Anselm College, the American Red Cross, the American Cancer Society, the Women's History Coalition, the American Nicaraguan Foundation, the Cuban Women's Club, the Latin Chamber of Commerce of the United States (CAMACOL) and Hispanic Media 100, among many others.

Mrs. Aguirre Ferré has earned the respect and trust of our community in South Florida, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dear friend and accomplished individual. I wish her continued success in her future endeavors.

FLYERS KEEP NORTH CAROLINA BASKETBALL IN THE SPOTLIGHT

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has a long and distinguished list of college basketball National Champions. This year, however, there is only one school from the Old North State that will earn the right to hoist a National Championship banner. No, I do not mean the North Carolina State University Wolfpack, nor the Duke University Blue Devils and not even the University of North Carolina Tarheels. Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Sandhills Community College Flyers upon their rise to the 2012 National Junior College Athletic Association Division III Championship.

Their 30–6 season ended with a commanding defeat of Cedar Valley College, from Dallas, Texas, by a score of 101–86. Outstanding play from Guard Daquain Towns, tournament MVP, and the tremendous coaching of Mike Apple led the Flyers, in only their third season, past teams in the play-offs from the Bronx, New York, Brookdale, New Jersey, and Prince George's County, Maryland. On March 17, the Sandhills Flyers became the first team from North Carolina to win a Division III National Championship and our office is proud to represent this fine group of young men. Each member of the Flyers deserves recognition for this outstanding achievement and they are:

Michael Collins, TJ Gill, Raheem Jolliffe, Chris Morrison, Daquain Towns, Dre Huntley, Chris Vinson, Trevor Cole, Mike Dorsey, Raheem Washington, Michael Robinson, TJ Jones, Tramaine Pride, Louis Craft, Kermeriaz Harrington, Erick Ewing, Markell Lotharp, Demontre Jones.

Coach: Mike Apple.

Athletic Director: Aaron Denton.

Congratulations also go out to Dr. John Dempsey and the Sandhills Community College family for putting together an organization that preserves North Carolina's premier basketball tradition while adding a new National Champion to our history books.

ALYSIA MORA-PINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alysia Mora-Pina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alysia Mora-Pina is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alysia Mora-Pina 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 Alysia Mora-Pina 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 her future accomplishments.

A TRIBUTE TO EVA ARRIGHI, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Woman's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Today, I stand to laud the tireless efforts of Eva Arrighi, a 22-year resident of Temple City, California, whose zealous approach to community service has benefited many people and organizations. Born in Cologne, Germany in 1931, Eva arrived in the United States in 1955 along with her husband Ivo, son Dan, and daughter Frances. After residing in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, Cleveland, Ohio, and Rosemead, California, respectively, Eva and her family moved to Temple City.

Throughout the years, Eva has maintained an active spirit for all her passions in life, and is involved with the community as a member of many organizations as a dedicated volunteer. Ms. Arrighi has been a volunteer and member of the Boy Scouts of America, particularly with Troop 169 Temple City, where her grandson achieved the rank of Eagle Scout. Eva volunteers for church activities at St. Peter's in Los Angeles, St. Anthony Catholic Church in San Gabriel, and St. Luke Catholic Church in Temple City, where she always lends a helping hand to assist at the St. Luke's Fiesta. The School of Fashion & Design in Alhambra has also benefited from Eva's devotion, as she contributes many hours working with physically and developmentally challenged students. Currently, Ms. Arrighi is an Ambassador for the Temple City Chamber of Commerce, where she assists in decorating for Chamber activities and provides food items and gifts for the Chamber's social mixers. She is also a member of organizations such as the Temple City Women's Club, Friends of Foster Children and the Historical Society of Temple City.

Ms. Arrighi is known for her generosity. She spends many hours knitting and crocheting countless items and selflessly gives everything away as gifts. Some of her creations include scarves, hats, baby blankets, slippers and socks. She donates to various fundraisers, community raffles, Chamber employees, Methodist Hospital Foundation and the School of Fashion & Design, to name a few.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an extraordinary woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Eva Arrighi, for her exceptional service to the community.

HONORING RICHARD LEE LAWRENCE

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of Richard Lee Lawrence, a devoted servant to the Roanoke Valley and the legal community of western Virginia, who passed away unexpectedly on March 19, 2012.

Born and raised in Roanoke, Richard was an active member of Scout Troop 21, where he attained the rank of Eagle Scout. He was always proud of this achievement. He regularly spoke about how important his scouting skills were to his overall education.

A graduate of Jefferson High School, Roanoke College, and Washington and Lee School of Law, Richard also served in the United States Marine Corps. He was a passionate student of American history, particularly the American Civil War, and also greatly enjoyed immersing himself in the various cultures of the world.

Above all else, Richard was dedicated to his work. He took great pride in the fact that he worked each day since his first newspaper job as a young boy. Despite being a pillar of the legal bar in the Roanoke Valley, Richard was never too busy to mentor young lawyers, including myself and my wife. As a boy, Richard was unfortunately the target of many bullies. Thankfully, he turned that resentment into a desire to fight for the "little guy." Many contend he will be best remembered for his dedication to the people who did not have an advocate or a voice.

While I knew Richard as a lawyer and friend, I was unaware of his dedication to attending church on Sundays. The priest at Richard's funeral made note that over the last five years he could count the number of times Richard had missed church on one hand. Always open and candid about his shortcomings, Richard's faithful devotion is humbling.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Richard's family and friends. I am honored to pay tribute to his many contributions to the community. His legacy and influence will be long remembered across the Roanoke Valley and throughout Southwest Virginia.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF GERRY CASHIN

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, in any successful office, there is always one person you need to be able to trust to make sure that things are done in the right way and on time. From the beginning of my service in Congress, that person in my office was my executive assistant, Geraldine "Gerry" Cashin. On the occasion of her retirement, I want to offer my personal thanks to Gerry for the dedicated and loyal service that she has given to me, the people of Alabama, and the citizens of our nation. Gerry was first with me in my law practice in Alabama and when I was elected to the House, I knew that I wanted her to come to Washington to help me with the challenge of setting up a new congressional office. Her organizational skills and personal concern for constituents helped our office to quickly establish a reputation for service and responsiveness. Gerry set a high standard with her dedication to her work and her attention to detail, and many of my staffers who have gone on to success in future endeavors have given credit to the lessons they learned from Gerry. Almost every day, the seemingly "impossible" was asked of Gerry and she unfailingly delivered, perfecting along the way such wry and legendary office phrases as "I'm sorry that happened" and "Never give a man something you haven't made a copy of." During the great challenges in Congress during recent years—from 9/11 to the financial crisis—Gerry stood as a rock of stability and a voice of calm and continuity. She has friends all over Capitol Hill and in Birmingham, and my wife Linda and I consider her to be part of our family for her many years of loyal service and heartfelt friendship. While the institutional knowledge that Gerry acquired cannot be replaced, my office's loss is the gain of her daughters Amanda and Diane and her grandsons John and Tom, with whom she will happily be spending much more time, and perhaps a gain for her tennis game as well. It is a pleasure for me to extend this public and well-deserved tribute to a servant of the people and a very dear friend, Gerry Cashin.

ELBRA WEDGEWORTH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the Honorable Elbra Wedgeworth for receiving the Community Impact Award from Metro Volunteers.

As an East Denver native, Elbra Wedgeworth has been a leader in Denver City Government for the past twenty-six years. In addition to her government service, some of her volunteer activities include Host Committee Member of the 2022 Denver Winter Olympics, 2011 Denver Region Sustainable Communities Executive Committee and founder of the African American Cultural Consortium and several other Boards and Councils.

The Honorable Elbra Wedgeworth is a highly admired individual who deserves recognition from the community for her leadership and the example she sets for others through her selfless service to those in need.

I extend my deepest congratulations to my friend the Honorable Elbra Wedgeworth for this well deserved recognition by Metro Volunteers. Thank you for making our community a better place for all of us.

HONORING JENNIFER L. SMITH

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and I want to take a moment to recognize the retirement of Jennifer L. Smith, CBO's Associate General Counsel. Ms. Smith is retiring after more than 32 years of service to the Congress.

She began her career at the Senate in 1979. While working for the Secretary of the Senate, she attended law school at night and became one of the Senate's Assistant Parliamentarians. She served as an Assistant Counsel for the House Budget Committee, the General Counsel for the Senate Budget Committee, and the Deputy General Counsel for CBO. In 2006, she returned to the Senate Parliamentarian's Office as the Senate Precedents Editor, and in 2010 returned to CBO as the Associate General Counsel.

In each of her roles, Ms. Smith worked tirelessly to ensure that the decisions of each office were carefully researched, well reasoned, and fully documented.

As an attorney for CBO, Ms. Smith ensured that CBO's estimates of legislation were based on a solid understanding of the law. Her skills as an attorney have been highlighted in the diverse issues she has worked on while at CBO, ranging from immigration to social security to lease-purchase issues. Her knowledge of appropriations law, copyright law, and the ethics rules of the House of Representatives rivals those of the most acknowledged experts in those fields.

Ms. Smith's excellent work has been recognized throughout her career. In 2005, as CBO's Deputy General Counsel, she received a CBO Director's Award for outstanding performance. And she has received a number of other awards recognizing her outstanding contributions at CBO.

Ms. Smith has exemplified CBO's high standard of professionalism, objectivity, and nonpartisanship. She has been a wise counselor and a frequent mentor. As important as the quality of her work, Ms. Smith's value as a colleague is unmatched. Her unfailing sense of humor, dependability, loyalty and her prowess on the softball field will not be forgotten.

We thank Jennifer Smith and commend her for her many years of dedicated, faithful, and outstanding service to CBO, to Congress, and to the American people. We wish her all the best in her well-deserved retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON AN OPEN SOCIETY WITH SECURITY ACT OF 2012

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the cherry blossom season begins, bringing thousands of Americans here, I rise to reintroduce the United States Commission on an Open Society with Security Act of 2012. The bill expresses an idea I began working on when the first signs of the closing of parts of our open society appeared after the Oklahoma City bombing, well before 9/11. This bill grows more urgent as an increasing variety of security measures proliferate throughout the country without any thought about the effects on common freedoms and ordinary public access, and without any guidance from the government or elsewhere. Take the example of government buildings. Federal building security has gotten so out of control that a tourist passing by a Federal building cannot even get in to use the restroom or enjoy the many restaurants located in areas otherwise devoid of such amenities. The security for Federal buildings has too long resided only in the hands of non-security experts, who do not take into account actual threats and, as a result, spend lavish amounts of taxpayer dollars on needless security procedures. For example, several years ago, Government Accountability Office investigators carried bomb-making materials into 10 high-security Federal buildings and then assembled them in the bathrooms. This scandal shines a light on the failure to use risk-based assessments in the allocation of resources.

The bill I reintroduce today would begin a systematic investigation that fully takes into account the importance of maintaining our democratic traditions while responding adequately to the real and substantial threat that terrorism poses. To accomplish its difficult mission, the bill authorizes a 21-member commission, with the President designating nine members and the House and Senate each designating six members, to investigate the balance of openness and security. The commission would be composed not only of military and security experts, but, for the first time, they would be at the same table with experts from such fields as business, architecture, technology, law, city planning, art, engineering, philosophy, history, sociology, and psychology. To date, questions of security most often have been left almost exclusively to security and military experts. They are indispensable participants, but these experts cannot alone resolve all the new and unprecedented issues raised by terrorism in an open society. In order to strike the security/access balance required by our democratic traditions, a diverse group of experts needs to be at the same table.

For years, parts of our open society have gradually been closed down because of terrorism and the fear of terrorism, from checkpoints on streets near the Capitol, even when there are no alerts, to applications of technology without regard to their effects on privacy.

Following the unprecedented terrorist attack on our country on 9/11, Americans expected additional and increased security adequate to protect citizens against this frightening threat. However, in our country, people also expect government to be committed and smart enough to undertake this awesome new responsibility without depriving them of their personal liberty. These times will long be remembered for the rise of terrorism in the world and in this country and the unprecedented challenges it has brought. We must provide ever-higher levels of security for our people and public spaces while maintaining a free and open democratic society. Yet this is no ordinary threat that we expect to be over in a matter of years. The end point could be generations from now. The indeterminate nature of the threat adds to the necessity of putting aside ad hoc approaches to security developed in isolation from the goal of maintaining an open society.

When we have faced unprecedented and perplexing issues in the past, we have had the good sense to investigate them deeply before moving to resolve them. Examples include the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (also known as the 9/11 Commission), the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (also known as the Silberman-Robb Commission), and the Kerner Commission, which investigated the riots that swept American cities in the 1960s and 1970s. The important difference in this bill is that the Commission seeks to act before a crisis-level erosion of basic freedoms takes hold and becomes entrenched. Because global terrorism is likely to be long lasting, we cannot afford to allow the proliferation of security measures that neither requires nor is subject to advanced civilian oversight, or analysis of alternatives and repercussions on freedom and commerce.

With no vehicles for leadership on issues of security and openness, we have been left to muddle through, using blunt 19th century approaches, such as crude blockades, unsightly barriers around beautiful monuments, and other signals that our society is closing down, all without appropriate exploration of possible alternatives. The threat of terrorism to an open society is too serious to be left to ad hoc problem-solving. Such approaches are often as inadequate as they are menacing.

We can do better, but only if we recognize and come to grips with the complexities associated with maintaining a society of free and open access in a world characterized by unprecedented terrorism. The place to begin is with a high-level commission of experts from a broad array of disciplines to help chart the new course that will be required to protect our people and our precious democratic institutions and traditions.

A TRIBUTE TO ELLEN SNORTLAND, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

I stand today to pay tribute to Ellen Snortland of Altadena, California, who is an inspiring and extraordinary individual. Ellen has spent her life following a variety of passions ranging from human rights to journalism to self defense. Ms. Snortland received a Bachelor of Arts from the University of California, Irvine in Theater and Film, and later a Juris Doctor, JD, from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles. After graduating, Ellen decided that she could provide the most service to her community as an advocate for women and children, a teacher, performer and media professional.

Ms. Snortland is the author of Beauty Bites Beast, which has been translated in Portuguese and Spanish, featured on Dateline NBC, and sold around the world. Ellen has also performed "Now that She's Gone," a one-woman show, which is a touching piece about family and forgiveness, and in 2008, was nominated for a Pulitzer in Drama. She has performed this show in New York, Los Angeles, Kansas, and France among other cities, states and countries.

She is currently a Board Member and lead female instructor for IMPACT personal safety, and teaches young boys and girls how to defend themselves from predators, both physically and verbally. She provides valuable services to our youth which they can draw from for their entire lives.

Ellen's accomplishments and roles in our community are innumerable. She serves on the Board of 50/50 Leadership and Consumer Watchdog, and is the Past President of the United Nations Association, Pasadena/Foothills Chapter. Ellen attended the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, the World Conference Against Racism in Durban, South Africa, in the year of 2001, and the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women for many years as part of the U.N. Press Corps as well as a NGO delegate.

Today, Ms. Snortland is a columnist for the Pasadena Weekly and a blogger for Ms. Magazine and Huffington Post. Ellen's work has been exceptional, and has proven that one woman can truly achieve all she sets her mind to.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an outstanding woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Ellen Snortland, for her exceptional service to the community.

ANDREA HILL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Andrea Hill for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Andrea Hill is a 7th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Andrea Hill 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 Andrea Hill 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 her future accomplishments.

U.S. COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Nina Shea, Dr. Don Argue, Dr. Richard Land, Dr. Elizabeth H. Prodromou and Felice Gaer for their service on the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). These commissioners have made significant contributions to USCIRF's work on behalf of the cherished right of freedom of religion or belief, including its deeper integration into U.S. foreign policy and national security. Since its inception, the commission has served as a voice for the voiceless, championing the plight of those whose most basic rights are threatened.

I would especially like to recognize the tireless efforts of Nina Shea, who has served on the commission since its creation. As a stalwart advocate, prolific writer and subject matter expert, Nina has played an invaluable role on the commission and her leadership will be sorely missed. She was at the forefront of much of the commission's work on Sudan and she took a prominent role in shining a bright light on extremist Wahhabi ideology coming out of Saudi Arabia. Early on, Nina recognized the precarious plight of religious minorities, notably Christians in the Middle East, and sought to develop policy recommendations that would ensure their continued existence and flourishing in the lands they have inhabited for centuries.

As director of the Center for Religious Freedom and a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, Nina will undoubtedly continue fighting the good fight on behalf of persecuted people worldwide.

TO HONOR AND CONGRATULATE LUMBERTON FIRE AND EMS ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Lumberton Fire and EMS on their 50th Anniversary.

Now 53 members strong, the proud ranks of the Lumberton Fire and EMS paid full and part-time EMS are preparing to grow again thanks to the leadership of Fire Chief James K. Philp and his team of operational officers and of course, organization President David Grass, Jr.

On Saturday, March 31, 2012, citizens from throughout Hardin County, Texas and Emergency Services District 2 will gather to celebrate the half century of service and safety that these brave first responders have provided for the people of this beautiful Southeast Texas community.

Serving some of the fastest growing communities in Texas like the City of Lumberton and its surrounding region, the Lumberton Fire and EMS serves 25,000 citizens and covers 122 square miles of territory. In 2011 alone, this Department responded to 2,102 calls for service.

Chartered on April 2, 1962 under the name Chance-Loeb Volunteer Fire Department, this department grew into the Lumberton Volunteer Fire Department just six years later.

In 1998, the name changed to Lumberton Fire/Rescue Services and then in 2003, the department began working in tandem with the EMS department in order to better serve the citizens of Lumberton and the surrounding community.

The two groups started the long process of merging both non-profit, tax exempt departments into one stronger, unified organization near the end of 2004.

In February of 2005, Lumberton Volunteer Fire-Rescue and Lumberton Emergency Medical Services were formally merged into the department we honor today—the Lumberton Fire & EMS.

This is a department that has been there throughout wildfires, hurricanes, tropical storms and so much more.

I am honored by their selfless service for these 50 golden years in the golden triangle. This is truly a significant milestone for this community and its dedicated firefighters, volunteers, and citizens who show their commitment every time someone calls 9-1-1 for help.

CDLS FOR VETERANS ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as our men and women return from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have a duty to honor their sacrifice and service. They are returning to an economy that has not yet fully recovered and, especially for those veterans under 35, they will face a higher rate of unemployment than the national average.

These servicemen and women come home with valuable experience and training, but often find that there is a disconnect between their service and requirements for employment in the civilian world. These men and women should not be forced to start over in their training for good-paying jobs like commercial truck driving.

The men and women who operated heavy machinery and combat vehicles come home with a wealth of knowledge and first hand experience. Our communities cannot afford to let this expertise go unused. Currently, if these professionals want to use their skills to become professional drivers, they need to go through training for a Commercial Driver's License as if they had no experience at all.

That is why I am introducing the "Commercial Drivers Licenses for Veterans Act." This legislation will provide grants to states to provide for the expedited training and licensing of veterans with prior experience operating heavy machinery and combat vehicles.

By passing this bill, we will not only ensure that our communities have the professional drivers they need, but we will show the men and women who have served our country that we value their experience and expertise.

ALICIA CHAVEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alicia Chavez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alicia Chavez is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alicia Chavez 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 Alicia Chavez 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 her future accomplishments.

HONORING MS. MARY SCOTT RUSSELL

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month I rise today to honor Ms. Mary Scott Russell, a dedicated and committed individual to the community of South Florida.

Ms. Russell, a native to Miami, is currently serving her fifth year as president of the Chamber of Commerce for Greater South Dade. She has served South Florida with distinction and admiration over the past two decades in various capacities. Ms. Russell served as the third female Mayor for the City of South Miami, Vice Mayor, Commissioner, and as chair of the City's Environmental Review and Preservation Board. During her tenure as Mayor, she created the Junior Commission for Women, allowing young women in the community to participate in an advisory group to the Mayor and City Commission on issues that affect their gender and age group.

Additionally, Ms. Russell was appointed President of the Miami Dade League of Cities, the fourth female leader of the organization in 50 years. Her dedication to issues concerning children and the environment is evident through her service on the Board of the Children's trust, and on the Fairchild Palms Board of Directors over the past 7 years.

Amongst her many roles and duties, she has found time to be a member of many organizations including, the General Obligation Bond Citizen Advisory Committee, Miami Dade College Center for Service Excellence Advisory Board, the College of Business and Technology Advisory Board, and the Informed Families South Miami Drug Free Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ms. Mary Scott Russell. She is not only a great mother, friend, and servant to the community, but also a leader who dedicates countless hours to making a difference for those around her. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

A TRIBUTE TO DEBRA SUH, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

I stand today to pay tribute to Debra Suh of Glendale, California, an extraordinary woman who selflessly works to strengthen our community and provide valuable resources where they are needed most. Debra worked at the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles as an attorney, where she established the Asian Pacific Islander Legal Unit, geared towards increasing the low-income immigrant community's access to legal representation and services. Debra has continuously pushed to provide this population with opportunities and a voice that might be denied them otherwise.

Since 1999, Debra has been the Executive Director of the Center for the Pacific Asian Family, CPAF, which is nationally renowned for its inspiring work to support immigrant Asian and Pacific Islander survivors of sexual and domestic violence. CPAF offers programs, which are imperative to women and children survivors, such as the 24-Hour Crisis Hotline, Transitional Shelter, Emergency Shelter, and Community Outreach programs. These provide a safe haven to people in need, and allow survivors to feel supported by their community.

Debra is an accomplished leader and dedicated volunteer, and has always found time to volunteer for various vital organizations. She served on the Board of Directors of the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, and was Board Vice President from 2008 to 2010. She is Past President of the Women's Organization Reaching Koreans and Korean American Bar Association. Ms. Suh's efforts have not gone unrecognized. She has been awarded the Durfee Sabbatical Award and the KCET/Union Bank Local Hero Award. Currently, Debra serves as Co-Chair of the California Emergency Management Agency's Domestic Violence Advisory Council and is a member of the Los Angeles Emergency Food and Shelter Program Board, Blue Shield of California's Foundation's Strong Field Project Advisory Group, the Los Angeles County DPSS Welfare Advisory Council, and the Los Angeles City Mayor's Nonprofit Advisory Group. In addition, Debra is a tireless volunteer at the local public schools where her two children attend; she teaches art, helps raise funds, and helps in the classroom.

Debra and her husband, Robin Toma, have two children, Nina Suh-Toma and Julian Suh-Toma.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an outstanding woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Debra Suh, for her outstanding service to our community.

RECOGNIZING THE RICHMOND POLICE ACTIVITIES LEAGUE ON 30 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize and congratulate the men and women of the Richmond Police Activities League as they celebrate 30 years of public service.

The Richmond Police Activities League was first established in 1982 to offer positive and proactive activities for local boys and girls between the ages of 5 and 18. Over the past three decades, Richmond PAL's programs have expanded to serve over 3,000 youth annually with excellent recreational, educational, social, and spiritual activities. Basketball, soccer, track, golf, baseball, football, and games like pool and ping-pong are great favorites at the PAL Center. They even have a state of the art recording studio which provides a unique opportunity for members to develop and showcase their talents.

Furthermore, Richmond PAL's after school programs have helped increase the number of Richmond students staying in school, and have encouraged students to strive for academic excellence. With the help of volunteer teachers and tutors, many of these students have dramatically improved their reading and writing skills.

In addition to the programs available at the Center, Richmond's Police Activities League offers field trips to local institutions such as the Lawrence Hall of Science, a ferry boat ride to San Francisco, or a visit to Fresno State University to explore the options of higher education. These field trips have encouraged many students to broaden their imaginations and have motivated them to achieve their goals.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Richmond Police Activities League and the dedicated men and women who have made it a success over the past thirty years. These programs have made a difference in the lives of countless children, and PAL continues to be a positive force in our community and a priceless benefit to all residents. I am pleased to congratulate the organization for its accomplishments in public service and wish them well with all their future endeavors.

ALEXANDER GALLEGOS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexander Gallegos for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexander Gallegos is an 11th grader at Jefferson Senior High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexander Gallegos 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 Alexander Gallegos 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 his future accomplishments.

SB 1070 AMICUS BRIEF

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 2012, the United States Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in United States v. Arizona, a case that could determine whether, through the guise of immigration enforcement, states can once again legally sanction discriminatory practices. Sixty-eight Members of Congress, including myself, have filed a brief to inform the Supreme Court that we believe that Arizona, through SB 1070, has unconstitutionally stepped upon exclusively federal domain. I stand before you today to explain why many of the leading Members of this Chamber have decided to take a stand against this law.

Arizona's SB 1070, like other state laws inspired by SB 1070, opens the gates for legally sanctioned racial profiling. If allowed to go into effect, Arizonans who look or sound "foreign" could be asked for their papers at any given moment—and punished for failing to produce them. We don't want to become a country where an accent or a skin tone could make you a suspect.

Our Framers gave Congress exclusive domain over immigration policy. Immigration policy, like foreign policy, must remain in federal hands. They understood that the United States needed a single immigration policy, because a patchwork of 50 immigration laws would create a logistical nightmare for U.S. citizens and immigrants alike. A family from Brooklyn, for example, shouldn't have to bring passports to visit the Grand Canyon, but that's what would be needed if a law like SB 1070 were allowed to go into effect.

Our Constitution guarantees that all people—no matter where they were born or what color of skin—have the same basic rights. These rights cannot be allowed to be threatened by a law like SB 1070, which, if allowed to go into effect, would undoubtedly lead to irreparable violations of these constitutional rights for anyone who appears to be "foreign." These "show me your papers" laws allow extremist legislators like those in Arizona and Alabama to turn back the clock on some of our hardest won and most important civil rights.

State-based immigration policy won't fix our federal immigration system. I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put aside partisan rhetoric and work together on creating a federal immigration policy that puts our family, economy, and country first. We must create an immigration system that reflects our values and moves us forward together.

It is up to the Supreme Court to ensure that all Americans, no matter their appearance, are treated equally. Failing to preserve these constitutional protections would undermine our values of liberty and justice for all.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF JAMES W. JARRETT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of James W. Jarrett, a successful businessman, a true gentleman, and a devoted husband and father. Jim died at the age of 67 on February 22, 2012, on a long planned climb on Mount Kilimanjaro with dear friends. Always an adventurer, he died doing what he loved.

I've known and worked with Jim and his family, and in particular his wonderful daughter Tracey. It was Tracey's Down Syndrome that inspired Jim to become a powerful advocate and prodigious supporter of those with developmental disabilities.

Jim Jarrett spent 28 years working at Intel Corporation. He began as the head of Investor Relations, was the company's first Internal Public Relations Manager, and served as President of Intel China and as Intel's first Vice-President of Global Public Policy. He retired in 2008.

Jim leaves his beloved wife of 43 years, Laurie, who was to join him in Africa at the end of his climb, for further travel in Africa. He also leaves his three daughters to whom he was incredibly devoted. He gave generously of himself to them and they valued the many gifts given to them in the times he spent with them. They were equally devoted to him, and the program from his memorial service listed ''60 Reasons We Love Our Dad,'' from Jim's 60th birthday celebration. Hearing each of his daughters speak at the service convinced every person who heard them that they could have come up with one hundred reasons easily.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our deepest and most sincere sympathy to Laurie, Tracey, Alison, Lindsay and her husband Justin, and to the entire Jarrett family. Our community and our country have suffered the loss of a great and good man.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $15,589,407,415,161.70. We've added $4,962,530,366,248.62 to our debt in 3 years. This is debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

A TRIBUTE TO NANCY E. GUILLEN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Today, I pay tribute to Nancy E. Guillen of Burbank, California. Born in Guatemala City, Guatemala, Nancy, who is the youngest of four children, immigrated to the United States in 1968 at the age of six, and became a U.S. citizen in the early 1980s. Upon graduating from John Marshall High School, Nancy attended Glendale Community College.

Ms. Guillen is the CEO of True Integrity Insurance & Payroll Services in Burbank. Prior to this career, Nancy worked in the medical field for over two decades. Aside from being a dedicated career woman, Nancy has always found time to volunteer and contribute many hours of service to a variety of organizations, including Kid's Community Dental Clinic, Glendale Noon Kiwanis, Family Service Agency of Burbank, The Salvation Army of Burbank, Ascencia, and Family Promise of East San Fernando Valley, where she also serves as a Board Member. Currently, Nancy is President of the Glendale Latino Association, and helps raise scholarship funds for Glendale Community College and Glendale High School students.

In addition to volunteering countless hours at homeless shelters, supporting families and children, and volunteering for nonprofit organizations, Nancy is also an avid supporter of breast cancer awareness. As a breast cancer survivor herself, Nancy participates in cancer walks, is involved with the American Cancer Society, Relay for Life in Burbank and Fiesta of the Spanish Horse to help raise funds to cure cancer. Ms. Guillen's commitment to help women who are battling breast cancer is admirable, and she always finds time to speak with them and support them in any possible way she can.

Nancy has two children, Juan and Cindy, and a granddaughter, Natalia, who she says are the greatest blessings in her life.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Nancy E. Guillen, for her exceptional service to the community.

HONORING WOMEN'S RIGHTS LEADER ELLIE SMEAL

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I honor Ellie Smeal, a true global leader for women and a national treasure on the Feminist Majority Foundation's 25th Anniversary. Since its founding in 1987, with Ellie's leadership, the Feminist Majority Foundation has advanced the legal, social and political equality of women, challenged the hostility that women's advancement faces, and recruited and trained countless young feminists to foster future leadership of the feminist movement.

The Feminist Majority Foundation received its name after a Newsweek/Gallup public opinion poll revealed that the majority of women in the United States self-identified as feminists. With the belief that feminist men and women are the majority, the organization has been on the forefront of the women's movement, championing women's equality, reproductive health, and non-violence. The Feminist Majority Foundation has achieved many triumphs that benefit women in the United States at the local, state and federal level and abroad: ballot initiatives to repeal state-wide abortion bans, recruiting an unprecedented number of women to run for elected office, resulting in 1992 being the Year of the Woman, and amending the 1991 Civil Rights Act to award monetary damages to women who win sexual harassment lawsuits in court. The Feminist Majority Foundation is the sole publisher of Ms., a feminist publication dedicated to covering issues impacting women around the world.

For more than two decades, Ellie Smeal, the President and Founder of the Feminist Majority Foundation, has fought for equality for women. She has held pivotal roles in nationwide and state efforts to achieve women's rights legislation and key court cases to advance women's rights. A gifted strategist and organizer, Ellie was the first to identify and highlight the ''gender gap'' and the differences in the ways men and women vote.

While President of the National Organization for Women, Ellie led the fight to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment through the largest grassroots effort in the modern women's rights movement. She continues to work tirelessly towards ensuring that men and women are granted equal rights by the United States Constitution. Last week, we celebrated the 40th anniversary of Congress's passage of the ERA and Ellie was front and center, staunchly affirming the need for the ERA.

A tireless advocate of women's reproductive rights, she developed a program to train clinic defenders in nonviolent clinic defense and fought a 12 year battle to allow American women access to mifepristone. Her organizing abilities have brought together all segments of the women's movement, including young feminist leaders. Ellie has been critical in recruiting the next generation of female leaders through her creation of the Choices Campus Leadership Program, which has produced nationwide campus based feminist groups.

Under Ellie, the Feminist Majority has focused on increasing the ranks of feminists running for office and has achieved numerous key legislative victories for women: the Violence Against Women Act, Pregnancy Discrimination Act, Civil Rights Restoration Act and many state and federal campaigns. Through her global advocacy, Ellie and the Feminist Majority called worldwide attention to the Taliban's treatment of women and prevented the United States and the United Nations from officially recognizing the Taliban government.

Having worked with Ellie on the ERA and so many other initiatives, I can personally attest that there is no one more determined and dedicated to advancing women's equality than Ellie Smeal. In Ellie, the women's movement has a tireless advocate and through her leadership of the Feminist Majority, women are closer to achieving political, social and economic equality. We are all fortunate to have witnessed and benefitted from Ellie's passionate commitment and determination. I am proud to have worked with Ellie and to call her my dear friend. In appreciation for her all she has accomplished, I am proud to congratulate her on the 25th Anniversary of the Feminist Majority Foundation and look forward to continuing our work to achieve equality for women.

INTRODUCING THE JUSTICE FOR WARDS COVE WORKERS ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Justice for Wards Cove Workers Act" in order to correct a grave injustice against thousands of Asian American workers that took place over a quarter century ago. In the 1970s, workers of Filipino, Samoan, Chinese, Japanese and Native American descent traveled north during the summer to work in the fish canneries in Alaska. Management at the Wards Cove Packing Company treated these migrant workers differently from white workers. They were forced to eat in separate dining halls, sleep in separate bunkhouses, and were unable to rise to top-paying positions in the company.

In 1973, two Seattle Filipino labor activists named Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes led several class-action lawsuits on behalf of these Asian American and Native American cannery workers alleging discrimination in the workplace. In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled against the Wards Cove workers, in Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio, which became a major impetus for the civil rights community to reverse the tide against employee rights. The result was the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which became the most comprehensive civil rights legislation signed into law since the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

However, what most civil rights communities forgot was that in the final hours before passage of the Civil Rights Act, a highly unusual and narrow amendment was inserted by two Senators from Alaska that exempted the Wards Cove workers from the expansive protections against workplace discrimination outlined in the Civil Rights Act. They feared that the Civil Rights Act could be applied retroactively to the workers.

The Senators' amendment was inserted in Section 402(b) of the Civil Rights Act, and its sole target was the Wards Cove workers. To date, the Wards Cove workers remain the only people who have been denied the rights promulgated by the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, while my bill cannot retroactively alter the Supreme Court's ruling or grant retroactive rights for the Wards Cove workers, it does remove Section 402(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 as a symbolic measure to right the wrong.

This is a legislative fight that I started in 1991, when I first introduced this bill. Every time I introduced this bill, it received bipartisan support but was never voted on the House floor. In 1993, then-President Bill Clinton wrote a letter of support for my bill, stating, "It is contrary to all of our ideas to exclude any American from the protection of our civil-rights laws."

Too often, the struggles of Asian American and other ethnic minorities do not get the attention they deserve by policymakers and law enforcement officials. The savage beating and murder of Danny Vega, a Filipino-American resident of South Seattle, last November is one of many examples of the discrimination that minorities continue to face.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Wards Cove workers by supporting this bill.

AARON CORMIER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aaron Cormier for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aaron Cormier is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aaron Cormier 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 Aaron Cormier 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 his future accomplishments.

HONORING HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN JOHN SULLIVAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a man I have come to know and respect during my service in the Congress, the House Parliamentarian John V. Sullivan, on the occasion of his retirement.

John Sullivan has served the House for 25 years, starting at the House Armed Services Committee and then moving to the Office of the Parliamentarian. The last eight years he has held the position of House Parliamentarian.

Prior to his work in the House, Sullivan served in the Air Force. I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not also mention that Sullivan is a Hoosier. He grew up in Northwest Indiana, graduating from Munster High School and after attending the Air Force Academy, returning home to earn his law degree from the Indiana University School of Law.

Indiana can take justifiable pride in John Sullivan and his service to the Congress and our nation.

The job of the House Parliamentarian requires integrity, intellect, good judgment and the ability to think quickly on your feet. The House Chamber can be a pressure-cooker at times, especially during votes on major pieces of legislation or at times of heated partisan rancor.

One of those times was the night of August 2, 2007, when a vote on the Republican motion to recommit the Agriculture Appropriations bill went awry. John Sullivan was on the House floor that night advising the Speaker pro tem, and he exhibited the type of courage and professionalism that the rest of us can only aspire to in such a difficult situation.

After that night, a select committee was appointed to investigate what happened during the vote, and I was appointed ranking member for the investigation. I got to know Sullivan very well during the course of the investigation, and I appreciated his honesty, candor and full participation in the investigation. From our many conversations and what we learned as a committee, it was clear to me that Sullivan could not be more dedicated to the House as an institution or his job as a nonpartisan provider of carefully considered analysis and advice. The House was fortunate to have his professional judgment on that night and all of the many other days and nights he has spent on the rostrum advising Speakers pro tem and Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the House will miss John Sullivan. We wish him the best in his retirement and trust that he will enjoy spending more time with his wife, Nancy Sands Sullivan, and three children Michael, Margaret and Matthew. We thank them for sharing Sullivan with the House these many years, and again, Mr. Speaker, we thank John Sullivan for his service and wish him well in his retirement.

SUPPORTING GOVERNOR ED RENDELL'S REMARKS REGARDING CAMP LIBERTY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by recent press reports attacking former Pennsylvania Governor, Ed Rendell for taking a stand in support of the residents of Camp Ashraf as well as Iran's main opposition movement, the MEK.

Mr. Rendell is not alone, and he is backed by several dozen senior former U.S. Government officials who have taken the same position because they feel that position actually serves the national security interests of our country. Some 21 senior officials from past administrations, whose job it was to keep this country safe, agreed with Mr. Rendell when they filed an amicus brief with the U.S. Court of Appeals-DC Circuit in February in support of delisting the MEK. Among the former officials were a CIA Director, a FBI Director, an Attorney General of the United States, a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a State Department coordinator for counter-terrorism, and a Marine Corps Commandant.

Governor Rendell spoke at an event in the Cannon Caucus Room on February 3, 2012 and eloquently made the case for why the MEK should have been delisted long ago.

Governor Rendell's views are in line with almost 100 Members of Congress who co-sponsored H. Res. 60 "Urging the Secretary of State to remove the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran from the Department of State's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations." I would like to submit Governor Rendell's comments for the RECORD.

REMARKS OF FORMER GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA ED RENDELL, U.S CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.—FEBRUARY 3, 2012

Good afternoon. I want to start out by saying I have come to many of these things. I have come to too many. It's not that I don't like you. You are a wonderful people. As Alan Dershowitz said, this has a feel of a civil rights movement.

I have been told how much myself and our other officials have helped this cause. But I look at where we are and I'm not sure that all of our speaking out, all of our rallies in front of the White House, Geneva, Paris and Brussels, here in Washington and in the Cannon Building, I'm not sure we have accomplished much.

And it is terribly frustrating to me. I want to stop coming to these meetings. I want to see you all in Teheran someday. (Applause)

We talk about how difficult it is to be at the end of the row speakers. So much has been said that we want to say ourselves. And today it's been said in resoundingly good fashion. Senator D'Amato talked about the fact that what our country has done here is a disgrace. And I echo those sentiments. When I first got involved with this issue and started learning about Ashraf and learning about the fact the United State's Government in general, United State's forces contracted with each and every one of the residents of Ashraf, if they relinquished their weapons, we promised them we would protect them.

Have we lived up to our promise? Absolutely not. Maybe until 2009 we did a pretty good job thanks to General Phillips and Colonel Martin, who is not with us today, we did a fine job of protecting them.

But all of a sudden in 2009, when we turned it over to the Iraqis, all responsibility for military action and police action was turned over to the Iraqis we essentially washed our hands on that promise. And yes, Senator D'Amato is right. In 2009 and in 2011, not only did this attack occur with the use of vehicles and weapons that had been given to the Iraqi police by the United States of America, but United States forces in both instances were withdrawn from the immediate area so they could not do anything to stop the carnage.

Is that what the promise was? Of course not. It's diametrically opposed to the promise we made. And that General was speaking for the United States of America and for all 300 million of our citizens.

Subsequent to that have we stood by the residents of Ashraf. Did we take a stand and say, wait. Why can't we do this right here in Ashraf? Why does it have to be a closure of the camp. To what purpose? Iraqi Government, tell me the purpose, legitimate purpose, Iraqi security or anything else that is going to be served by closing down Ashraf. Well, the only excuse we ever heard was the belief that there's intimidation in Ashraf and the individuals could not be free to speak their will about where they wanted to go.

Well, that would have been an easy problem to solve. Just set up, the General can tell me where, set up something outside the gates where individual residents one by one can talk freely right there.

There was no need to close Ashraf in the beginning. And the United States Government should have stood by and residents, stood by our promise and said, no.

And then how are we going to ensure protection of the residents? Well, it's my belief that we should have done one of two things; one, we should have left a small number of United States Marines to protect the residents of Ashraf. (Applause)

We agreed to leave. Well, we agreed to leave South Korea. And, General, am I right, are there still U.S. military personnel in Korea. And how many years has that been? About 40. So we could have easily done that and lived up to our responsibilities. One of my proudest moments was when the President said, we aren't going to let the residents of Benghazi be subject to genocide.

And U.S. military power and NATO power is going to stop that from happening. And we did. We toppled one of the worst dictators. We never contracted with the people in Benghazi. We never promised them anything. But we as America, we believed it was our right to do so and we did. We signed a contract with these residents. They are much better position to expect our help and protection than the residents of Benghazi were. One of the things the director will tell you is we get on almost weekly calls with Ambassador Freeh that was handling this for the State Department. It is stunning to me that the United States Government wants to disengage here.

They didn't want to be part of signing of the MOU. They reluctantly agreed to, after pressure from us, to send the U.S. observers into so-called Camp Liberty, although it's not clear when they are coming.

They can't come unannounced. We have disengaged. We wiped our hands of an issue where we gave our word. So, yes, it's time for the U.S. to stand up. It's time for us to fulfill our responsibility. It's time to not only fulfill our obligation to the resident of Ashraf. It's time to fulfill our obligation to 4,000 plus United States soldiers who died in Iraq.

You have heard me say as Governor of Pennsylvania I was the commander in chief Pennsylvania National Guard. No national guard in the country lost more men and women in Iraq than Pennsylvania did.

I used to comfort the families, try to comfort the families, by telling them their sons or in one case their daughter, had died creating democracy and making Iraq a better place. I don't know what I will say to them now knowing what I know about what is happening here.

So it's time for us to act. What should that action be? First and foremost we should not let Camp Liberty be turned into a prison. We should not. That's Job 1 for the United States. Job 1 for the UN.

Freedom of movement was essential. Everyone says this is a refugee camp. It's meeting the standards of a refugee camp. What is the difference between the normal refugee camp and what is proposed in Camp Liberty?

The difference is the residents of the normal refugee camp can leave. They can go if they have the ability, if there's a park or river down the road, they can go to the river, and bathe, swim, they can go to the park, if they have money, they can go to the local market.

They have freedom of movement. That makes a huge difference when you are talking about what goes on in a camp. Here the Iraqis have made it clear, as long as their position holds, freedom of movement, the people are going to be inside the small area forever. We should insist that, the U.S. should insist there be freedom of movement. We should insist the MOU be enforced. There is not one resident of Ashraf over there yet and the MOU is being put aside. The MOU clearly says the residents can take personal property and vehicles. The Iraqis now say that's not the case.

It is time for us, the United States, to join the UN and be heard loud and clear, whatever the leverage is, I agree with Ambassador Ginsberg, we have got to have leverage, and we should enforce it. It's time to be heard. Time to say no one is going. No on is leaving. (Applause)

And next it is time to de-list. If you have been coming to these regularly, you have heard me say I think we should put de-listing on the back burner. And the most important thing is the safety of the residents.

But I don't believe that anymore. Let me tell you why. I was sent the Forest News Agency release. The Iranian Ambassador, and let me read you a couple of quotes from this release. The Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq stress that the representatives in Iraq in meetings they have had repeatedly stressed that the UN considers the MEK a terrorist group and will not support it under any circumstances.

It goes on. Referred to U.S. officials support for the terrorist group. He referred to us and said, the terrorist MEK group in the past few years has been constantly supported by the U.S. and western elements. But it is interesting now that the U.S. Government has announced it's not prepared to accept even one member of this terrorist organization and under no circumstances will allow them onto its soil. It goes further. It said the members of the terrorist group by the Government of Iran will not include and the amnesty will include individuals whose hands are not tainted in blood. Meaning that this idea that we relocate all the residents of Ashraf to Liberty and there will be no rest. He's given fair warning here.

What was our response? We brought all this up for his response. His response was, oh, the Iranians they exaggerate all the time. They don't really tell the truth. You can't believe anything they say.

That's not engagement. That is not us living up to our responsibility. It is time to de-list just because of these statements. (Applause)

We have sent a message. We think it's time to act. It is time to stand up. If the State Department won't de-list as it should voluntarily, it's time to go back to court. It's time to say to the Court we want you to mandamus. That's a legal term in which the court requires an agency or an individual to do what they are statutorily required to do. The Court gave an order to the State Department to come back and show evidence why the MEK should not be de-listed. The Court can issue a mandamus to say to them come in here within 30 days and show us why the MEK should not be de-listed.

Now some people say, don't issue, don't go seek a mandamus. That means the State Department will say we are not de-listing them. If they say that, then the Court is asked to review the evidence. When they reviewed the evidence in 2008, when the Secretary Rice refused to de-list, they found there wasn't any evidence.

If they review the evidence in 2012—guess what? No evidence. So it's time to stand up and say, this is not a terrorist organization. No evidence to the contrary.

In the last decade no open source terrorist database, and they are all over the internet, has listed one single act by the MEK or any members of terrorism. And the statute says terrorist acts against the United States America. That hasn't happened. Never going to happen.

So let's de-list. Let's give all the Congressmen who came in here and they have spoken up, they have passed resolutions. Those are all good things. Those are all increased pressure. But it is time—Senator D'Amato was saying there would be a bill along lines of what Ambassador Ginsberg said, the only way to hit them is to hit them where it counts.

No military planes or any other equipment to the Iraqi Government until boom, boom, boom. Don't say we are not a party to this. We were a party to stopping the slaughter in Benghazi. We never promised we would.

We are a party to this because, number one, we promised. And number two, because we are the United States of America.

HONORING KAREN KELLEY-ARIWOOLA FOR HER SERVICE TO THE MINNEAPOLIS FOUNDATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, after 18 years of outstanding service Karen Kelley-Ariwoola is leaving her position as Vice President of Community Philanthropy for The Minneapolis Foundation.

During her tenure, Karen has made a deep and lasting mark on both the Foundation and the metropolitan Minneapolis community. Her leadership in education, early childhood, and racial equity issues is renowned nationwide and her persistent, collaborative, and compassionate efforts have contributed to many of Minnesota's recent gains in each of these areas.

In the aftermath of the May 22, 2011 tornado that struck Minneapolis, Karen has played a critical role in raising and distributing well over $1 million dollars in relief. She also has assisted many local agencies in creating a new model for collaboration and a new vision for North Minneapolis. She implemented the same collaborative leadership strategy after the I–35W Bridge collapsed and fell into the Mississippi River just over 4 years ago.

Karen's great work has helped The Minneapolis Foundation maintain its commitment to transforming education, promoting economic vitality, and building social capital. These efforts enable us to create a more equitable community and Minnesota's 5th Congressional District is grateful for her service.

As the U.S. Congressman representing Minnesota's 5th Congressional District, I honor Karen Kelley-Ariwoola for her accomplishments and wish her and her family health, happiness, and prosperity.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOAN AND ALAN WALNE

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Joan and Alan Walne for their dedicated service to the city of Dallas and Fair Park. On April 3, 2012, the Friends of Fair Park will present the Walnes with the 2012 Spirit of the Centennial Award.

As long time residents of the Lake Highlands neighborhood in Dallas, Texas, the Walnes have worked hard over the years to actively improve their community through numerous civic and nonprofit organizations. Joan, a graduate of Baylor University, has devoted much of her time and effort to improving the local school system. She has served as PTA President, on various Richardson Independent School District committees and local school councils. Additionally, she is active in the Junior League of Dallas, Equest, Children's Medical Center of Dallas and is currently serving as President of the Dallas Park and Recreation Board. Similarly, Alan, a graduate of Texas Tech University, has generously given of his time and spirit to various organizations and charitable causes, including the East Dallas Chamber, the Down Syndrome Guild of Texas, the Lake Highlands YMCA, and the Salesmanship Club of Dallas. His strong belief in service led him to run for Dallas City Council where he faithfully represented District 10 for seven years.

I am proud to count Joan and Alan among my good friends. Their dedication and service to the city of Dallas epitomizes community spirit and selflessness. Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in congratulating Joan and Alan as they receive this year's Spirit of the Centennial Award for their years of service and commitment to Fair Park.

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN VICTIMS OF POGROMS AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the victims of pogroms against Armenians in Sumgait (1988), Kirovabad (1988), and Baku (1990), and the ethnic-cleansing of the Armenian population of Azerbaijan.

I hope that by speaking out publicly against these atrocities I will help reaffirm America's commitment to an enduring, peaceful and democratic resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

It is sickening that even during modern times, less than 25 years ago, brutal attacks on Armenians occurred in Azerbaijan.

Thomas de Waal, in his book Black Garden, described the massacres of Sumgait as:

"Gangs, ranging in size from about a dozen to more than fifty, roamed around, smashing windows, burning cars, but above all looking for Armenians to attack. The roving gangs committed acts of horrific savagery. Several victims were so badly mutilated by axes that their bodies could not be identified. Women were stripped naked and set on fire. Several were raped repeatedly."

But shockingly most of the Azeris who committed these horrific acts and their accomplices in government were not brought to justice.

The Sumgait Massacres are part of a long and disgraceful history of violence against the Armenian people that also includes successive massacres in Kirovabad and Baku.

It is past time for the United States to officially recognize the Armenian genocide and to support the security and self-determination of the independent Republic of Nagorno Karabakh.

This anniversary should serve as a reminder that we can stay silent no more.

Let's take this moment to remember all those who lost their lives at Sumgait, Kirovabadk, and Baku and pledge to prevent ethnic cleansing from occurring anywhere in the future.

RESOLUTION HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF CÉSAR CHÁVEZ'S 85TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of civil rights leader and labor organizer César Chávez. On the anniversary of what would have been his 85th birthday, I stand before you to pay tribute to a man who sacrificed and dedicated his life to championing the rights of farm workers and all working families.

A true pioneer and hero, César Chávez inspired a nation by organizing immigrant and minority farm workers to courageously fight for fair pay, fair benefits and fair working conditions. His legacy serves as a testament that every worker deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.

As a child, I too learned about the significance of the movement he began. When my brothers and sisters begged our mother for grapes, she refused. It was her way of standing in solidarity with Americans across the country who were supporting the grape pickers' strike led by Chávez' United Farm Workers Union.

Almost 50 years after the creation of the United Farm Workers Union, Chávez' contributions to our country live on. Thanks to him, thousands of Latinos and farm workers can now work with the dignity and respect they deserve. He inspired a generation of labor leaders to use non-violent protest to accomplish powerful things.

As a proud union member myself, I am honored to commemorate and celebrate the memory and work of César Chávez.

THE SUPREME COURT OF ISRAEL AGAIN DEMONSTRATES ITS INTEGRITY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important examples Israel gives to the world is how an independent judiciary, committed to the rule of law, can act even in a nation in which security considerations are paramount—as they have had to be in Israel since 1948, when it was attacked at the very moment of its birth.

Earlier this week, the Supreme Court of Israel issued a ruling that Migron, an illegal settlement established in the West Bank, must be dismantled and the occupants removed. While it is clear that some of the areas that are now reserved for Jewish citizens of Israel should remain in place after a two-state peace agreement is signed, these are the areas immediately adjacent to Israel, especially in and around Jerusalem. Those settlements far from that area should never have been allowed to be established, and they should now be removed. Those of us who believe strongly in Israel's right to a continued existence as a secure, democratic, independent state have a particular responsibility to point out that those who create and defend these settlements may undermine the chances of achieving such a result.

There are strong public policy reasons for objecting to these unauthorized, illegal settlements, as we learned when the Obama administration was so successful in blocking a U.N. vote to recognize Palestinian statehood. The defeat of that effort, led by the Obama administration's aggressive diplomacy, was a far better result for Israel in the U.N. than we have seen in many years. And it is clear that it was because President Obama has expressed his disagreement with the existence of many of these settlements that he had the credibility to achieve that diplomatic victory.

But the Supreme Court of Israel is not motivated by these political considerations. Rather it is committed to the rule of law—a strong distinction between Israel and most of its neighbors. Given the pressures that are brought to bear against the Judiciary in the name of security, a phenomenom we have seen in our own country at various times, the decision by the Israeli Supreme Court to order the dismantlement of an illegal settlement deserves praise and it is important that the Netanyahu administration carry out this court order. It would be a gift to critics of Israel if there were to be any faltering in the Israeli Government's standing behind this decision of its Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in an editorial on March 28, noted this, and because the example of a Supreme Court, in a nation that is engaged in a serious effort to protect itself against external enemies, is standing up for the rule of law in the face of pressures to the contrary is so important, I ask that the editorial from the New York Times, entitled "Israel's Top Court vs. Outposts" be printed here.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 25, 2012]

ISRAEL'S TOP COURT ORDERS SETTLERS TO LEAVE OUTPOST

(By Ethan Bronner)

JERUSALEM.—Israel's Supreme Court on Sunday ordered a West Bank settlers' outpost built on private Palestinian land to be dismantled by Aug. 1, rejecting a government compromise with the settlers that would have allowed them to stay put for another three years.

The decision was much anticipated, because the panel of three judges who decided the case included the court's conservative new chief justice, Asher Grunis, and because the case involved the politically explosive issue of moving settlers in the face of potentially violent resistance.

Whether the government will remove the 50 families living in the outpost before the deadline will also be closely monitored.

In their ruling, the judges chided the government for having failed to evacuate the outpost in accordance with an earlier high court decision.

"This is a necessary component of the rule of law to which all are subject as part of Israel's values as a Jewish and democratic state," the decision said.

The case concerns Migron, a settler outpost near the West Bank city of Ramallah. Migron is one of the largest of dozens of small enclaves that have a different status under Israeli law than the 120 full-blown settlements in the West Bank.

Although the larger settlements, home to about 330,000 Israeli Jews, are considered in violation of international law by a vast majority of foreign governments, Israel views them as legitimate; not so for the smaller outposts, which Israel views as illegal because they went up without its authorization. Despite that status, most of the outposts have been provided with basic infrastructure by the government.

Nearly a decade ago, Israel promised the United States that it would dismantle a number of the outposts in preparation for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Palestinians want to build a state on land that is now partly occupied by the settlers. But almost no outposts have actually come down, and Israeli-Palestinian negotiations are frozen.

Meanwhile, Migron stands out among the outposts because its land is not simply part of a theoretical future state of Palestine but also because it has been shown to belong to private Palestinian owners. The state did not dispute that finding, although the settlers say that no proof of ownership was provided.

Palestinians represented by an Israeli lawyer took the case to the Supreme Court, along with Peace Now, a left-wing Israeli group that opposes the settlements. The case dragged on for years, but last summer the court said the outpost had to be dismantled by the end of March 2012, a deadline the new ruling extends to Aug. 1.

The government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, which is a strong defender of the settlers and wanted to avoid a confrontation, suggested a compromise—let the residents of Migron remain until a new authorized community could be built nearby where they could relocate upon its completion in 2015.

The plaintiffs returned to the court last week and told the court that to accept such a deal would be to flout the rule of law.

One of the three justices who heard last week's arguments, Salim Joubran, indicated the court's leanings at the time: "You say the outpost will move in three years, but I know this type of behavior. Three years will inevitably turn into eight."

Right-wing legislators said Sunday that they would introduce legislation to legalize Migron and other outposts. Dani Dayan, a leader of Israel's settler movement, said that the court's ruling would empower the violent extremists in his community who have long argued that there was no point in seeking compromise.

Tzaly Reshef, a founder of Peace Now and a lawyer, said the decision would not change the fact that "supporters of the settlements remain in power." But he called it "very meaningful in terms of the constitutional system in Israel."

Mr. Reshef said that had the case been decided the other way, "it would have been almost the end of the existence of the courts as the protectors of the rule of law in this country, as well as the ultimate victory of the settlers."

He continued, "The government, threatened with violence if it tries to remove settlers, tried to convince the court that it should pull back from its decision, which is based on the basic right of ownership of private property."

The next test, Mr. Reshef said, would be whether the government is "able to change facts on the ground."

Mr. Netanyahu said the government would honor the court's decision and uphold the rule of law.

A TRIBUTE TO JOANNA VARGAS, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Today, I pay tribute to Joanna Vargas of Alhambra, California, an accomplished woman who has brought multi-generations together and joy to the lives of many, through her extraordinary vision for the arts. Born and raised in Alhambra, Joanna is a graduate of Alhambra High School and opened her first dance studio at the age of 26.

Joanna's passion for the arts has been evident throughout her career. She is the creator of an astounding number of projects and has an exhaustive list of accomplishments. Joanna has launched various dance companies for adults and teens, created Alhambra's Monthly Mosaic Art Walk, Jayvee Dance Center, the Annual Maxt Out Dance Competition, "Streetease Fitness and Dance" classes and instructional DVDs, and the Alhambra Hot Spot, which is home to an annual art event that celebrates music, dance, art and fashion. She is also the Chief Executive Officer of Dance for Peace Charity, a non-profit she established two years ago.

In addition to her projects, it is noteworthy to mention Ms. Vargas's unparalleled service to the community. Joanna is a Board Member of the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce, a member of the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce, charter member of the Rotary International New Generation Club, and President of the City of Alhambra Downtown Business Association.

Joanna is a charitable woman who gives back to her community through her invaluable service. She has awarded scholarships to deserving underserved teens and children, and to people who have the desire to further their dance training.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Joanna Vargas, for her exceptional service to the community.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOHN L. COOMBS

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Lieutenant Colonel John L. Coombs who has served this great Nation in the U.S. Army since 1989, most recently as the Acting Director of Operational Contracting Support and Policy with the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Procurement.

John L. Coombs enlisted as a Private and began his Army career as a Light Infantryman with the 7th Infantry Division in Fort Ord, California. He was soon recommended for and graduated from the Officer Candidate School where, in 1992, he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Chemical Corps. As a Chemical Officer, he served as a Battalion and Brigade Chemical Officer in artillery, cavalry, and aviation battalions and brigades for the 1st Armored Division in Germany and the 1st Cavalry Division in Texas. In 1995, he deployed to Bosnia-Herzegovina as the nuclear, biological and chemical reconnaissance platoon leader. There he developed tactics, techniques, and procedures to detect environmental hazards at industrial sites occupied by U.S. forces, leveraging the capabilities of the mobile mass spectrometers installed in the nuclear, biological and chemical reconnaissance vehicles.

In 2001, Captain Coombs was accessed into the Acquisition Corps, attended the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California and in 2002 graduated with a Master of Science in Business with an emphasis on federal contracting. From 2002 to 2005, as the Contracting Division Chief in the Wiesbaden Contracting Center for the U.S. Army Contracting Command, Europe, Captain Coombs supervised more than 30 contracting officers who awarded and administered more than $400 million in annual contract awards. He deployed to Kosovo for six months as the Chief of a Joint Contracting Center, where he led a joint military staff, U.S. civilians and Kosovar nationals to procure $5 million in annual contract awards. While in Kosovo, his work helped to improve multi-national relations when he negotiated a complex settlement for damages to a hotel occupied by NATO forces. The following two years, Major Coombs served as the Deputy Chief of Office in the Italy Regional Contracting Office for U.S. Army Contracting Command, Europe. He oversaw high visibility procurements including letter contracts to lease properties supporting the 2006 Winter Olympics security operations in Torino. He was named the Army Europe Contracting Officer of the year in 2005. An Army fellowship at the RAND Arroyo Center in Santa Monica, California brought this Hamilton, Ohio native back to the U.S. There he developed RAND's recommended acquisition strategy for Future Combat Systems to balance cost control for the Army and risk to the contractor. Since 2008, Lieutenant Colonel Coombs has been assigned to Army Headquarters at the Pentagon. He has served as the Executive Officer, Deputy Director and several senior positions in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Procurement. His expert knowledge of operational contracting policy for military operations, natural disasters and humanitarian relief has been invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, for more than two decades, Lieutenant Colonel John L. Coombs has faithfully served our Nation as a dedicated steward for American taxpayers. As he enters this next phase of his life with his beloved wife Kellie and their four children; Lyndsay, Adam, Emily and Jesse; I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lieutenant Colonel John Coombs upon his retirement and thank him for his service in the U.S. Army.

CONGRATULATING THE LOUISVILLE BALLET ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have the distinct privilege of recognizing and celebrating the Louisville Ballet on its 60th anniversary. As Kentucky's official ballet company, the Louisville Ballet has long been a source of pride and distinction for the people of our community and the Commonwealth.

Since its formation in 1952, the Louisville Ballet has transformed from a small, understaffed-yet-dedicated company, to one of the Southeast's premier artistic institutions—employing a world-class company of dancers and an equally talented staff of professionals that make each performance come to life.

Today, the company has a repertoire of more than 150 works, has been the recipient of numerous accolades, and maintains the distinction of being the only regional company to perform with the great Mikhail Baryshnikov. It also contributes to the artistic and cultural core of Louisville, which is one of only 11 U.S. cities with all five major arts institutions.

Under the leadership and vision of Artistic Director Bruce Simpson, the past 10 years have been among the Ballet's strongest, with the company commissioning 13 world premieres. Each performance offers the precision and grace witnessed among ballet's elite.

On behalf of the 3rd Congressional District, I wish the Louisville Ballet Company future success and look forward to another 60 years of excellence and awe-inspiring performances.

CELEBRATING THE 191ST ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 191st anniversary of Greek independence. It is an honor to recognize a nation whose rich and vibrant history not only laid the foundation for democracy, but whose immigrants and descendants have enriched the cultural landscape of our Nation.

The warm friendship that America shares with Greece is rooted in the indelible mark of democracy and self-determination that Hellenic culture has left on our country. We note that the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people. Our Founding Fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy.

And just as our founding fathers were guided by these principles in their fight for independence from the British Crown, so too were the founders of modern-day Greece, who declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25th, 191 years ago.

Since the birth of both Nations, we have shared the desire to uphold the values of freedom, equality, and justice championed by the Ancient Greeks. We have joined together to promote peace and stability in the world. Indeed, Greece is our ally and our partner, having supported the United States in every major international conflict throughout the 20th century. Though rooted in ancient ideals, our strong allegiance continues today through a shared belief that freedom and democracy are the building blocks of peace.

At home, we recognize the contributions of Greeks in the areas in culture, literature and architecture.

I trust that the bonds between our two Nations will remain strong for years to come.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 191st anniversary of their independence.

HONORING CESAR ESTRADA CHAVEZ

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the legacy of an American icon, Cesar Estrada Chavez, leader of the United Farm Workers, born on March 31, 1927. This Saturday, we celebrate the 85th anniversary of his birth.

Cesar Chavez was born in Yuma, Arizona, to a life filled with early hardships, poverty and racial and social injustice. These experiences were his first lessons in what our nation should not be for millions of Americans.

As a result of his family's losses during the Great Depression, Cesar Chavez's family, like so many others, migrated to California to work in the farm fields picking crops in hopes of economic stability. They eventually settled in San Jose where they lived in a barrio called Sal Si Puedes, "Get Out If You Can."

Cesar Chavez often recalled the early injustices he experienced in school, and later as a farmworker. He vividly remembered throughout his life the prohibition of Spanish in school and being punished for speaking it. . . or even the signs in his community that said "Whites Only."

His experience was universal for many in that era, whether they were Latino, African-American, Asian American or others facing discrimination. My own father encountered signs that read "No dogs and Mexicans Allowed" during this time.

It was on account of this type of blatant discrimination and racism that Cesar Chavez devoted his life to fighting for social and economic justice in our nation. Events around our nation remind us that the need for such a champion is still present today.

In 1962, alongside Dolores Huerta, Cesar Chavez founded the National Farm Workers Association, later to become the United Farm Workers, an organization that came to be known as the driving force of the organized labor movement for farmworkers in the U.S.

This movement, or "La Causa" as it was known in millions of homes including mine, taught us that solidarity, even in the face of brutal adversity can lead to victory. The "No

Grapes'' campaign and boycott led by Cesar Chavez and UFW was an omnipresent part of my youth and of many of my colleagues serving here today.

We knew what it meant to not buy grapes and not eat them, to feel proud of being part of something bigger than ourselves, even if it meant going without something we loved, or answering curious questions from friends or classmates. And for me, when victory came, it was sweet—literally and figuratively—and my small sacrifice seemed like the most powerful thing in the world.

On the 85th anniversary of Cesar Chavez's birth, we are reminded that his personal story is one of transformation and legacy. He transformed his early experiences from Sal Si Puedes into ''Si Se Puede'', ''Yes, we can.''

Those words still ring true today, and serve as a mantra of hope for millions of Americans who seek fairness and equal treatment. Just ask the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today we reflect on Cesar Chavez's lifetime of advocacy in the pursuit of social justice. Let us hope our legacy will be as enduring as that of our beloved leader and brother Cesar Chavez.

A TRIBUTE TO DENISE HOULEMARD JONES, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Every year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Today, I pay tribute to Denise Houlemard Jones of Pasadena, California. A brilliant businesswoman with many years of experience, Denise is a Management Consultant at DMJ Consulting Services, a business she started, where she provides advisory services to companies, colleges, agencies and individuals. She received a B.A. in Sociology and Economics from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a MBA from the University of Southern California.

It is noteworthy to mention Denise's unparalleled volunteer service to the community, which includes an impressive list of accomplishments. She has been a member of the Los Angeles Chapter National Black MBA Association, National Association of Female Executives, Pasadena Talks, Points of View Committee, Women At Work Young African American Women's Conference, Black Women's Forum, City of Pasadena Intergroup Relations Advisory Committee, and the City's Recreation Commission, among others. Ms. Jones has also been involved with the Community Health Alliance of Pasadena, CHAP, serving as a founding member, acting as President several times, and currently serving on the Marketing Committee. Presently, Denise is a member of the National Council of Negro Women, Saint Andrew Catholic Church, YWCA Pasadena—Foothill Valley, American Association of University Women, City of Pasadena Northwest Commission, and the Pasadena Delta Foundation, Inc., where she is a founding member.

Along with being a successful career woman, Ms. Jones has devoted countless hours of her time volunteering for the Alkebulan Cultural Center, American Institute for Cancer Research, Foothill Unity Center Food Pantry, and the Latino History Parade and Jamaica. She is also an annual fiesta volunteer at Saint Andrew Catholic Church.

Some of the honors Ms. Jones has received include the National Merit Award, the William L. Blair Award for Service and Leadership, the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Leadership Award, the YWCA Women of Excellence Award, and the Women In Action's ''Wind Beneath Wings'' Award.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Denise Houlemard Jones, for her outstanding service to the community.

THE HOMEOWNERS TAX FAIRNESS ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Homeowners Tax Fairness Act. In February of this year, the 49 state attorneys general announced that they had completed negotiations with the country's five largest mortgage servicers to settle claims arising from mortgage fraud and wrongful foreclosures. The settlement, which amounts to over $25 billion is the largest settlement this country has seen since the 1998 Master Tobacco Settlement.

This historic settlement will allow hundreds of thousands of distressed homeowners to stay in their homes through enhanced loan modifications and principal reduction, and it will also provide payments to victims of unfair foreclosure practices. Unfortunately, under current law, those settlement payments would subject the homeowners and servicemembers who receive them to additional tax burdens. For instance, homeowners receiving relief in the form of mortgage debt forgiveness and direct cash payments for wrongful foreclosure could be subject to federal income tax. Moreover, additional tax would be owed on the payments made to servicemembers who were wrongfully foreclosed on while deployed overseas.

To prevent that injustice, the Homeowners Tax Fairness Act would extend the exclusion for debt forgiveness on a primary residence throughout the term of the settlement agreement, and exclude the relief payments from income for homeowners and servicemembers. This bill also considers the particularly egregious actions taken by the five largest banks in violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. Over the past three years, the five largest servicers violated the law and wrongfully foreclosed or overcharged mortgage interest on servicemembers, many of whom were deployed overseas in combat zones. Accordingly, the Homeowners Tax Fairness Act not only excludes this relief from income to servicemembers, but denies these banks the ability to deduct these payments from their federal income taxes.

The estimated 1.7 million homeowners eligible to benefit from this settlement deserve to receive the full benefit of this relief—relief that was negotiated in good faith by the states, the banks, and the federal government. Collecting federal income tax on relief for struggling homeowners is not only bad policy, but is simply the wrong thing to do.

As we move forward from one of the worst recessions in American history, we must be vigilant and provide as much help to the American people as possible. This bill will do just that, and will ensure that our homeowners and servicemembers get every bit of relief they deserve.

HONORING ANN KAPLAN'S SERVICE AS A MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS BOARD OF GOVERNORS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an admirable public servant and a dear friend.

Ann Kaplan, a celebrated constituent from the great state of New York, has served selflessly and diligently as a member of the American Red Cross Board of Governors since 2003 and next week will complete her third and final term on the Board.

The American Red Cross depends upon experienced leadership that understands the significant operational challenges it faces in delivering a full range of services each and every day. From supporting the armed forces around the world to safely supplying nearly half the Nation's blood supply to directly helping the American public and businesses prepare for and respond to over 70,000 disaster annually, the American Red Cross Board of Governors plays an integral role in developing effective strategy for the organization.

During Ann Kaplan's service on the Board of Governors, the American Red Cross has gone through an unprecedented internal transformation including comprehensive governance reform resulting in bold changes that are a model of corporate governance, and internal restructuring in order to eliminate a significant operating deficit, streamline operations, and improve service delivery.

Ms. Kaplan has made significant contributions to the organization through her service on the Board including leading the Board-directed mandate to address the organization's operational and financial issues and to restructure the oversight of investments. Her service on the Board includes the following leadership positions: Vice Chair, Finance Committee (2005–2006); Chair, Finance Committee (2006–2008); Vice Chair, Compensation and Management Development Committee (2009–2012); Chair, Investment Committee (2010–2012); and Vice Chairman of the Board (2007–2012).

While Red Cross Board members normally serve two terms, Ms. Kaplan served a third term at the unanimous request of the Board during a critical period because of her passionate and able leadership and financial expertise.

Ms. Kaplan has been a generous supporter of the American Red Cross and has served the organization in various other capacities including Co-Chair of the Chairman's Council, which recognizes individuals and families whose cumulative giving to the American Red Cross exceeds one million dollars. She also served as a disaster relief volunteer with the New York City Chapter, which serves my district.

I rise on behalf of my Congressional colleagues, the Hon. Bonnie McElveen-Hunter, the Chairman of the American Red Cross, and, the entire Board of Governors, Gail J. McGovern, President and CEO and all the staff and volunteers of the Red Cross to thank Ms. Kaplan for her extraordinary service as a member of the Board of Governors.

March might be American Red Cross Month in America. But the first week of April will be a week to honor and celebrate Ann Kaplan's contributions to strengthen the organization as it strives to better serve this great Nation.

HONORING MERCER MIDDLE SCHOOL'S WINTER FOOD DRIVE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mercer Middle School in Aldie, Virginia, which recently finished a winter food drive.

As a result of this, Mercer students were able to donate 600 pounds of food to Loudoun Interfaith Relief, the largest food pantry in Loudoun County. I sincerely appreciate their efforts to address the serious challenge of hunger in our community.

As hard as it may be for some to believe, families are going hungry in Fairfax and Loudoun counties in northern Virginia. I have been meeting with the local food banks and pantries on a regular basis for the past several years and they all tell me demand is at an all-time high. In fact, families who used to regularly donate to some food pantries are now coming to receive food. One local pantry actually closed for several days last fall because its shelves were bare.

On March 23, I attended a wonderful event at Mercer where the students presented the food donations to Loudoun Interfaith Relief. I was impressed by their hard work and their service to their community. This service project could not have been possible without the support of Principal John Duellman and PTA President Karen Goodwin.

I congratulate all the students, teachers and parents who participated in Mercer Middle School's winter food drive.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF LARRY LAVENDAR

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are only as effective as the loyal staff members who serve them. Our staff professionals are public servants every bit as much as those of us who have been elected. Motivated to work for the common good, they perform their jobs without fanfare and frequently stay on the job late nights and weekends to help develop solutions to the challenges facing our people and country. This House could not function without these highly talented and dedicated individuals, and it has been my privilege to have had one of the best at my side in Larry Lavender. As he departs from my office after many years of loyal service, I want to publicly recognize and thank Larry for his wise counsel, frank advice, and friendship. When Larry agreed to be my Chief of Staff when I was first elected to the House, he brought experience as a businessman and top administrator in the city government of my native Birmingham, Alabama. He shared my ethic that the purpose of our office was to provide the people of Alabama with the highest level of representation. From the start, Larry demonstrated a unique talent to assemble the best staff team to achieve goals. When I was selected to serve as Ranking Member and then Chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, there would be no one better suited to serve as my staff director. Larry's policy, management, and leadership skills helped us to navigate the challenges of the deepest financial crisis to occur in the United States since the Great Depression. During those historic times, his sole intent was to work to find the right answers to solve the unprecedented issues facing our financial sector and nation. Under highly uncertain and stressful conditions, he consistently supplied wise and reasoned counsel. Everyone who has met Larry has been impressed by management ability, policy and political acumen, strong belief in principle, and above all his modesty and integrity. Just as important to Larry, he is a devoted husband, father, and Marine. His children Rachel and Jacob are rightfully proud of him, and we know that his lovely wife Kathryn and young son Harrison Clay have brought a special new joy to his life at home. For being a trusted and valued adviser to both experienced and new House Members, a mentor to countless staffers, and a loyal friend to me, it is with appreciation and gratitude that I take this opportunity to permanently commemorate Larry Lavender's service to the people of Alabama and America.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 1987, Congress declared March to serve as "Women's History Month," in efforts to acknowledge the important role women have played in shaping America. In honor of this occasion, I would like to recognize the leadership of County Councilwoman Joyce Dickerson, my good friend, who has proudly been serving the constituents of the Second District in Richland County, South Carolina, since January 2005. Councilwoman Dickerson is committed to creating economic development opportunities and growing relationships between constituents and elected leaders in South Carolina. As President-elect of the National Foundation for Women Legislators and the incoming Chair, I commend Joyce Dickerson for her efforts to empower elected women in South Carolina and across this great Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO DIANE GIN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2012

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year during the month of March, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

I stand today to pay tribute to Diane Gin of Monterey Park, California. Not only has Diane raised an incredible and successful extended family, she has also dedicated her life to improving the lives of the families around her. Diane grew up in Los Angeles, and attended California State University, Los Angeles, where she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Child Development. Since then, she has amassed an astounding thirty-five years of experience in the classroom, and is currently a 4th grade teacher in the City of South Gate at State Street Elementary School.

Ms. Gin has proven herself to be a leader outside of her own classroom, exemplifying a true dedication to improving the lives of our youth. She has served as President of the Mark Keppel High School PTSA, and President of the Alhambra PTA Council for the Alhambra Unified School District, and continues to serve the PTA Council as chair of the scholarship committee, although she has no children presently attending school. In addition, Diane has served as the parent coordinator for the Orange County Dance Association.

Today, Ms. Gin serves as President of the United Methodist Women at the Monterey Park Shepherd of the Hills United Methodist Church. She has chaired the Staff Parish Relations Committee and educational program, and currently teaches a Friday night youth group and Sunday school. Diane is also the Past President of the United Methodist Women of the Pasadena District, and has served on the Staff Parish Relations Committee for the District Superintendent of the Pasadena District.

Diane continues to reach out to our youth, serving as a Girl Scout troop leader for 25 years, where she currently sits on the Gold Award Review Committee, which interviews applicants for the Gold Award.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an outstanding woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Diane Gin, for her exceptional service to the community and to our Nation's children.

TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF HOMELESS FOR VETERANS

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, no veteran should ever experience homelessness. I don't have to tell anyone in this body that this, unfortunately, is not the case. According to a point-in-time study, on one January night in 2009 an estimated 75,609 veterans experienced homelessness and veterans are vastly over-represented in the homeless population in America. The Department of Veterans Affairs has developed a number of programs to assist homeless veterans and, while more can be done, it's important to make sure that all homeless veterans can access the programs designed to help them.

In order to qualify for benefits available to homeless veterans through the VA, an individual must meet the definition of "homeless" codified as part of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. In 2009, the HEARTH Act expanded the definition of homeless to reflect our present reality and include individuals in transitional housing, persons living in motels and persons who would imminently lose their housing. A change was also made to the McKinney-Vetno Act to expand the definition of homeless to include individuals fleeing a situation of domestic violence or some other life-threatening condition. This change, however, is not currently reflected in the definition of "homeless veteran."

That is why I am introducing this legislation, which will correct and expand the definition of "homeless veteran" to include veterans who are fleeing situations of domestic violence. This small change will allow those veterans who find the courage and the means to leave their abusers the chance to access the benefits that should be available to all homeless veterans.

By passing this bill, we will ensure that this especially vulnerable population of veterans has the chance to access benefits the Department of Veterans Affairs already provides. This bill is one small step to ensuring every homeless veteran can access the benefits they deserve.

HONORING MS. MARIA TRAVIERSO

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History month I rise today to honor Ms. Maria Travierso, a professional bilingual journalist serving the South Florida community.

Ms. Travierso graduated from the University of Costa Rica with a Bachelor's degree in Journalism and Public Relations. She furthered her education by learning English at Florida National College and Miami-Dade Community College. Ms. Travierso began her journalism career as a reporter for La Republica newspaper in Costa Rica in 1980. However, her talents were truly recognized when she became Editor-in-Chief of El Diario, a community newspaper based in Miami. Her passion and commitment to journalism is clearly evident, and admirable.

Ms. Travierso most recently served as Senior Editor and Copy Editor of the Sun-Sentinel, a position she held for many years. Her thorough reports on various topics ranging from immigration policy to Hispanic culture have informed countless English and Spanish speaking individuals in South Florida. During her tenure, she received various awards and recognitions including first place in Community Story Writing for the Spanish Language Division in the Florida Society of News Editors 2010 Competition.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ms. Maria Travierso for her continued service to the South Florida community and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN V. SULLIVAN, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN, UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate House Parliamentarian John V. Sullivan on his retirement from the U.S. House of Representatives. John, who was appointed House Parliamentarian by former Speaker Dennis Hastert on May 31, 2004, will retire at the end of this month after serving 25 years in the parliamentarian's office. John became only the fourth parliamentarian to serve in the House since the office was established in 1928.

John Sullivan is one of the most exceptional parliamentarians I have had the pleasure to serve with during my 35 years in Congress. John has always handled himself with the utmost professionalism and has always held himself to the highest standard. There is no sharper mind or greater expert on parliamentary procedure than John Sullivan. Members on both sides of the aisle have relied on his expertise and extensive knowledge of the legislative process. I echo the Speaker and Minority Leader's comments that his retirement is "a loss for the people's House."

Over the years, I have seen a steady and disturbing decline in the civility and comity in the House of Representatives. There have been more heated exchanges and political bickering on the House floor in recent years than I care to remember. However, through it all, John has been able to navigate the House through some difficult times and has reminded all of us that we should respect our colleagues and the rules of this great institution. His steady leadership, intellect and nonpartisan decision making has made it possible for this body to continue to function despite the political rancor.

Throughout my life, I've tried to emulate those for whom I have great respect. John Sullivan is one of those people that I will always admire and respect. Not only am I a better legislator, but I am also a better person for having known John Sullivan. I wish John the best in his retirement and thank him for his years of service to this great body and to our Nation.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2779 AND H.R. 2682

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to discuss two bills that this Chamber passed earlier this week, H.R. 2779, a bill to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and H.R. 2682, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act.

The stated intent of these bills seems simple enough—to make supposedly necessary exemptions and clarifications to the Dodd-Frank Act. However, Americans for Financial Reform, a coalition of over 250 unions, consumer groups, think-tanks, and others have raised some serious concerns about the negative consequences these changes could have on the implementation of the law, and also question whether these changes are even necessary.

Certainly it is appropriate for Congress to revisit laws that have been passed, and to conduct oversight of the work of regulators. However, Congress has asked the Commodities Futures Trading Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission to do a complicated job monitoring a big and complex market.

How big and how complex? According to The Economist, the world's gross domestic product totals approximately $65 trillion. The total value of the global trade in derivatives is estimated to be 10 times larger than that—over $600 billion. Warren Buffett has even stated that derivatives are "financial weapons of mass destruction, carrying dangers that, while now latent, are potentially lethal." Unfortunately, as the spectacular collapse of AIG made clear, we know that he was right.

The Dodd-Frank Act was passed to reign in the abuses that caused the financial crisis, and to establish clear rules of the road to help prevent another crisis from ever happening. I believe, as Americans for Financial Reform point out, that the law provides regulators with the flexibility to address the issues that H.R. 2779 and H.R. 2682 seek to address without changing the statute. We need to let them get on with the job they've been asked to do.

Therefore, I opposed passage of these measures.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF LEWISVILLE FIRE CAPTAIN TERRY WILCOX

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a brave and dedicated leader, Lewisville Fire Department Captain Terry Wilcox. Captain Wilcox has spent his entire career of almost 38 years serving in the Lewisville Fire Department, protecting and promoting the safety of the citizens of the City of Lewisville.

Captain Wilcox is a highly respected member of both the community and the Fire Department. A lifelong resident of Lewisville, he graduated high school in May 1974 and joined the Fire Department in September of the same year to give back to the community that raised him. As a testament to his hard work and leadership, on May 1, 1985 he was promoted to Captain, a rank he has held for almost 27 years.

Captain Wilcox is married to Charlotte Wilcox, who also gives back to the community by serving on the Highland Village, Texas City Council. Together they have two children, Tiffany and Travis, as well as two grandchildren. In what little spare time is available, Captain Wilcox is an avid fisherman and hunter, hobbies he enjoys together with his son.

On March 31, 2012, Captain Wilcox will retire from the Lewisville Fire Department as the most senior officer ever in the history of the department. After almost four decades of public service, his leadership, professionalism and dedication will not be forgotten by the City of Lewisville. His devotion to his career, his fellow firefighters and the citizens of Lewisville are absolute and will be deeply missed by all those that he has had the opportunity to assist and influence.

It is my great privilege to recognize Lewisville Fire Department Captain Terry Wilcox for his service, and I am privileged to represent the City of Lewisville in the U.S. House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO RIVERSIDE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CITIZEN OF THE YEAR GORDON BOURNS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Riverside, California are exceptional. Riverside has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Gordon Bourns is one of these individuals. On March 28, 2012, Gordon will receive a prestigious honor when the Riverside Chamber of Commerce names him the 2011 Citizen of the Year at the organization's annual awards and installation dinner.

Gordon Bourns joined Bourns, Inc. in 1973 and has managed various business units and operations within the company since that time. He was elected Chairman of the Board in December 1988 by the company's Board of Directors, and was also elected President in 1990.

Mr. Bourns now serves as the company's Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Bourns heads a worldwide electronics corporation, which manufactures more than 3,000 different products at 12 domestic and international facilities, with over 4,000 employees worldwide. Mr. Bourns is the son of the cofounders of Bourns, Inc., Marian and Rosemary Bourns.

Mr. Bourns represented Bourns, Inc. in 1994 when the Corporation received the prestigious Entrepreneur of the Year Award from Inc® Magazine. Mr. Bourns currently focuses much of his attention on strategic planning to accomplish the company's strategic plans, which will double the sales and profits of Bourns over a five-year period. Mr. Bourns has led the Bourns commitment through the Six Sigma and Bourns Production System quality process to assure the company meets or exceeds customer requirements and specifications, while anticipating future needs through the continuous improvement of people, processes, products and services.

Mr. Bourns has been an active participant in community affairs. He is a member of the Board of Directors for the UCR Foundation and is the past chairman of that board. He serves as Chairman of the Board of Advisors for the Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering at UC Riverside and as Chairman of the Board of Visitors at California Baptist University. He is also Chief Financial Officer of the School Board for the Woodcrest Christian School System. Mr. Bourns, an Eagle Scout, is a past recipient of the Inland Empire Boy Scouts Distinguished Citizen of the Year Award.

In light of all Gordon Bourns has done for the community of Riverside, the Riverside Chamber of Commerce named Gordon their Citizen of the Year. Gordon's tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the community of Riverside, California. He has been the heart and soul of many community organizations and events and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives this prestigious award.

HONORING THIS YEAR'S CREDIT UNION CHERRY BLOSSOM TEN MILE RUN AND 5K WALK

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the many Members of Congress who serve as Honorary Race Chair for this year's Credit Union Cherry Blossom Ten Mile Run and 5K Walk.

I'm even prouder that my daughter, Patricia Lehtinen, will be taking part in the ten mile race, which will be held this Sunday, April 1 at 7:30 a.m.

Beginning and ending at the grounds of the Washington Monument, this race raises awareness for the Children's Miracle Network and has helped millions of children in hospitals who might not otherwise be able to afford treatment.

Children's Miracle Network is a network of 170 affiliate hospitals across the United States, including Miami Children's Hospital in my South Florida community.

Miami Children's is a world leader in pediatric healthcare and South Florida's only freestanding hospital dedicated exclusively to children.

I thank the nearly 200 of my congressional colleagues who are also Honorary Race Chairs for this year's event.

Our congressional community can get involved and make a difference together, without fanfare, or votes, or debate and just do the right thing and help.

I encourage everyone do their part and help in this worthy cause.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on 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 29, 2012 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 18

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine financial management and business transformation at the Department of Defense.
SD–G50

APRIL 25

2 p.m.
Armed Services
Personnel Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD–106

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine current readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–232A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2115–S2185

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2242–2249, and S. Res. 408–410. **Page S2166**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 80, condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. Res. 344, supporting the democratic aspirations of the Nicaraguan people and calling attention to the deterioration of constitutional order in Nicaragua, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 356, expressing support for the people of Tibet, and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 391, condemning violence by the Government of Syria against journalists, and expressing the sense of the Senate on freedom of the press in Syria, and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 395, expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Chicago, Illinois from May 20 through 21, 2012, and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 397, promoting peace and stability in Sudan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble. **Page S2166**

Measures Passed:

Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 408, supporting the goals and ideals of Take Our Daughters and Sons To Work Day. **Page S2184**

Financial Literacy Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 409, designating April 2012 as "Financial Literacy Month". **Pages S2184–85**

Measures Considered:

Paying a Fair Share Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2230, to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers. **Pages S2117–49**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 29, 2012, with the time until 11:30 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders of their designees with the Majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes. **Page S2185**

Oil Tax Subsidies Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 2204, to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and promote renewable energy and energy conservation, be at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 29, 2012, and that at 11:30 a.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill. **Page S2185**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 59 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 61), Miranda Du, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada. **Pages S2149–54, S2185**

By 96 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. EX. 62), Susie Morgan, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana. **Pages S2149–54, S2185**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Robert James Grey, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014.

John Gerson Levi, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014.

Laurie I. Mikva, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2013.

Martha L. Minow, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014.

Gloria Valencia-Weber, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014. **Page S2185**

Messages from the House: **Page S2165**

Measures Referred: **Page S2165**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S2165**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S2165**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2165–66**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2166–73**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2164–65**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2173–83**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2183**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2183**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—62) **Pages S2153–54**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 29, 2012. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2185.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Francis S. Collins, Director, Anthony S. Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Richard J. Hodes, Director, National Institute on Aging, Thomas R. Insel, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Acting Director, National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, Griffin P. Rodgers, Director, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and Harold E. Varmus, Director, National Cancer Institute, all of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine Department of Defense health programs, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Patricia D. Horoho, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and Commander, U.S. Army Medical Command, Vice Admiral Matthew L. Nathan, Surgeon General of the Navy, Lieutenant General Charles B. Green, Surgeon General of the Air Force, Major General Jimmie O. Keenan, Chief, United States Army Nurse Corps, Rear Admiral Elizabeth S. Niemyer, Director, Navy Nurse Corps, and Major General Kimberly A. Siniscalchi, Assistant Air Force Surgeon General, Medical Force Development Nursing Services, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, after receiving testimony from Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations and Environment, Major General James A. Kessler, Commander, Marine Corps Installations Command, and Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (Facilities), Rear Admiral David M. Boone, USN, Director, Shore Readiness Division, and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics, Terry A. Yonkers, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Logistics, Kathleen I. Ferguson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Major General William H. Etter, Deputy Director, Air National Guard, and Major General James Jackson, Deputy Chief, Air Force Reserve, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after receiving testimony from Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, after receiving testimony from Major General Merdith W.B. Temple, Acting Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, both of the Department of Defense; and Anne Castle, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, and Michael L. Connor, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, both of the Department of the Interior.

ENHANCING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Service and General Government concluded a hearing to examine enhancing economic growth, focusing on the Department of the Treasury's responses to the foreclosure crisis and mounting student loan debt, after receiving testimony from Timothy F. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower received a closed briefing on the *Ohio*-class Replacement Program in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Vice Admiral John T. Blake, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Integration of Capabilities and Resources (N8), both of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Jo Ann Rooney, Acting Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Robert F. Hale, Under Secretary, Comptroller, and Chief Financial Officer, David L. McGinnis, Acting Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, and Jonathan Woodson, Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs and Director, TRICARE Management Activity, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded open and closed hearings to examine Department of Defense nuclear forces and policies in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Madelyn R. Creedon, Assistant Secretary for Global Strategic Affairs, Andrew C. Weber, Assistant Secretary for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs, Lieutenant General James M. Kowalski, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, Lieutenant General Janet C. Wolfenbarger, USAF, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Rear Admiral Terry J. Benedict, USN, Director, Strategic Systems Programs, Major General William A. Chambers, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration, Major General Noel T. Jones, USAF, Director, Operational Capability Requirements and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Plans, and Requirements, and Colonel Timothy A. Woods, USAF, Director, Strike System Program, all of the Department of Defense.

RETIREMENT SAVINGS DEFICIT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine retirement, focusing on examining the retirement savings deficit, after receiving testimony from Michael Calabrese, New America Foundation, and Jack VanDerhei, Employee Benefit Research Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; and James G. Rickards, Tangent Capital Partners LLC, New York, New York.

SCIENCE AND STANDARDS OF FORENSICS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the science and standards of forensics, after receiving testimony from Patrick D. Gallagher, Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology; Subra Suresh, Director, National Science Foundation; and Eric S. Lander, Broad Institute of Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

U.S. POLICY ON IRAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy on Iran, after receiving testimony from Thomas Pickering, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, General James Cartwright, former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense, and Karim Sadjadpour, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, all of Washington, D.C.

WASTE AND FRAUD IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security concluded a hearing to examine assessing efforts to combat waste and fraud in Federal programs, after receiving testimony from Representatives Platts and Towns; Daniel I. Werfel, Controller, Office of Management and Budget; Sheila O. Conley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Finance and Deputy Chief Financial Officer; and Beryl H. Davis, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, Government Accountability Office.

SPECIAL COUNSEL'S REPORT ON THE PROSECUTION OF SENATOR TED STEVENS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Special Counsel's report on the prosecution of Senator Ted Stevens, after receiving testimony from Henry F. Schuelke III, Janis, Schuelke and Wechsler, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michael P. Shea, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, who was introduced by Senator Lieberman, Gonzalo P. Curiel, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, who was introduced by Senator Blumenthal, and Robert J. Shelby, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, who was introduced by Senator Lee, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Margaret Bartley, of Maryland, who was introduced by Senator Murray, and Coral Wong Pietsch, of Hawaii, who was introduced by Senator Akaka, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 4273–4294; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 601, were introduced. Pages H1739–40

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H1741–42

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 600, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–424). Page H1739

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Harper to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H1643

Recess: The House recessed at 10:41 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H1647

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Dennis Culbreth, First Baptist Church, Jasper, Alabama. Page H1647

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 300 yeas to 111 nays with 4 answering "present", Roll No. 142. Pages H1647, H1665

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow. Page H1652

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Amending title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States: H.R. 1339, amended, to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 6 nays with 4 answering "present", Roll No. 141. Pages H1652–54, H1664

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To designate the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.". Page H1664

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022: The House began consideration of H. Con. Res. 112, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022. Further proceedings were postponed.

Pages H1665–H1731, H1731–38

Rejected:

Mulvaney amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that sought to strike the text of the bill and insert President Obama's budget proposal as scored by CBO (by a recorded vote of 0 ayes to 414 noes, Roll No. 143); **Pages H1705–10, H1729–30**

Cleaver amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that sought to make investments in education, job training, transportation and infrastructure, and advanced research and development programs that will accelerate our economic recovery. Would protect the social safety net without cutting Social Security, Medicaid or Medicare and close certain corporate tax loopholes and preferences, saving trillions of dollars on the deficit over the next decade (by a recorded vote of 107 ayes to 314 noes, Roll No. 144); and

Pages H1710–17, H1730

Cooper amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that sought to establish the budget for FY 2013 and set forth the appropriate budgetary levels for FY 2014 through FY 2022 (by a recorded vote of 38 ayes to 382 noes with 2 answering "present", Roll No. 145).

Pages H1717–29, H1730–31

Proceedings Postponed:

Honda amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 112–423) that seeks to provide for deficit reduction and job creation that protects the social safety net. **Pages H1731–38**

H. Res. 597, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 140, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 139.

Pages H1654–62, H1663–64

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1647.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1662, H1663–64, H1664, H1665, H1729–30, H1730, and H1730–31. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing on H.R. 3283, the "Swap Jurisdiction Certainly Act"; H.R. 1838, to repeal a provision of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act prohibiting any Federal bailout of swap dealers or participants; and H.R. 4235, the "Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2012". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—AMERICAN MANUFACTURING AND JOB REPATRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on American Manufacturing and Job Repatriation. Testimony was heard from Patrick Gallagher, Director, National Institute of Standard and Technology; Subra Suresh, Director, National Science Foundation; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing for American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witnesses. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Treasury. Testimony was heard from Timothy Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Hilda L. Solis, Secretary, Department of Labor.

APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Bureau of Reclamation. Testimony was heard from Michael

Connor, Commissioner of Reclamation, Bureau of Reclamation.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL GUARD AND U.S. ARMY RESERVE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve. Testimony was heard from General Craig R. McKinley, Chief, National Guard Bureau; Lieutenant General William E. Ingram, Jr., Director, Army National Guard; Lieutenant General Harry M. Wyatt III, Director, Air National Guard; and Lieutenant General Jack C. Stultz, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve.

APPROPRIATIONS—JUDICIAL CONFERENCE AND U.S. COURTS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for U.S. Judicial Conference and U.S. Courts. Testimony was heard from Julia S. Gibbons, Chair, Budget Committee of the U.S. Judicial Conference; and Thomas F. Hogan, Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

APPROPRIATIONS—LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Loan Guarantee Program and Advanced Research Projects Agency Energy. Testimony was heard from Arun Majumdar, Director, ARPA–E; and David Frantz, Director, Loan Guarantee Program.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND AND U.S. FORCES—KOREA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces—Korea. This was a closed hearing.

KOREAN PENINSULA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on the security situation on the Korean Peninsula. Testimony was heard from General James D. Thurman, USA, Commander, United Nations Command, Republic of Korea—United States Combined Forces Command, and United States Forces Korea; and Peter Lavoy, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Policy) for Asia and Pacific Security Affairs.

ARMY AND MARINE CORPS MATERIEL RESET

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on the Army and Marine Corps Materiel Reset. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Raymond V. Mason, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, G4 U.S. Army; and Lieutenant General Frank A. Panter, Jr., USMC, Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reviewing the President's Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Proposal for the U.S. Department of Education''. Testimony was heard from Arne Duncan, Secretary, Department of Education.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSES TO RISING GASOLINE PRICES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''The American Energy Initiative: A Focus on Legislative Responses to Rising Gasoline Prices''. Testimony was heard from Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Robert Abbey, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Christopher A. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Oil and Natural Gas, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

CYBERSECURITY: THREATS TO COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity: Threats to Communications Networks and Public-Sector Responses''. Testimony was heard from Fiona Alexander, Associate Administrator, Office of International Affairs National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), Department of Commerce; Admiral James A. Barnett (Ret.), Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; Bob Hutchinson, Senior Manager for Information Security Sciences, Sandia National Laboratories; Roberta Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary for Cyber Security and Communications, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

PENDING PROPOSALS AND EMERGING ISSUES CONFRONTING REGULATORS, STANDARD SETTERS AND THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Accounting and Auditing Oversight: Pending Proposals and Emerging Issues Confronting Regulators, Standard Setters and the Economy''. Testimony was heard from James L. Kroeker, Chief Accountant, Securities and Exchange

Commission; James R. Doty, Chairman, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board; Leslie Seidman, Chairman, Financial Accounting Standards Board; Robert Attmore, Chairman, Governmental Accounting Standards Board; and public witnesses.

COLLAPSE OF MF GLOBAL: PART 3

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The Collapse of MF Global: Part 3". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 4240, to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes. The bill was ordered reported without amendment.

INVESTIGATING THE CHINESE THREAT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Investigating the Chinese Threat, Part One: Military and Economic Aggression". Testimony was heard from Larry M. Wortzel, Commissioner, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and public witnesses.

PRICE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY WITH CHINA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The Price of Public Diplomacy with China". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 2179, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to United Service Organizations, Incorporated, and for other purposes; H.R. 2764, the "WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2011"; H.R. 3140, the "Mass Transit Intelligence Prioritization Act"; and H.R. 3563, the "Alert and Warning System Modernization Act of 2011". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2179; H.R. 2764; and H.R. 3563. The following bill was ordered reported, without amendment H.R. 3140.

RIGHTSIZING TSA BUREAUCRACY AND WORKFORCE WITHOUT COMPROMISING SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled "Rightsizing TSA Bureaucracy and Workforce Without Compromising Security". Testimony was heard from Christopher L. McLaughlin, Assistant Administrator, Security Operations, Transportation Security Administration; Sean J. Byrne, Assistant Administrator for Human Capital, Transportation Security Administration; and James G. Duncan, Assistant Administrator for Professional Responsibility, Transportation Security Administration.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security held a hearing on the following: H.R. 4223, the "Safe Doses Act"; H.R. 3668, the "Counterfeit Drug Penalty Enhancement Act of 2011"; and H.R. 4216, the "Foreign Counterfeit Prevention Act". Testimony was heard from Dara Corrigan, Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs, Food and Drug Administration; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S NEW IMMIGRATION DETENTION STANDARDS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing entitled "Holiday on ICE: The U.S. Department of Homeland Security's New Immigration Detention Standards". Testimony was heard from Kevin Landy, Assistant Director, Office of Detention Policy and Planning, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and public witnesses.

MOTION TO ISSUE SUBPOENAS

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a business meeting on a motion to authorize the Chairman to issue duces tecum subpoenas for the production of documents relating to investigations regarding: the Secretary of the Interior's decision and the process to rewrite the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule under the Surface Mining Reclamation and Control Act; and the process used in the preparation of a Department of the Interior report on offshore oil and natural gas operations under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act that implied that peer reviewers from the National Academy of Engineers had endorsed an offshore oil and natural gas drilling moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico. The motion was approved.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4281, the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012". The Committee granted, by a record vote of 7 to 4, a closed rule providing one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Finally, the rule waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rule on the same day it is reported to the House, against any resolution reported on the legislative day of March 29, 2012, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure extending expiring surface transportation authority.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Securing the Promise of the International Space Station: Challenges and Opportunities". Testimony was heard from William H. Gerstenmaier, Associate Administrator, Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Cristina Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; and Lieutenant General Thomas P. Stafford, USAF (Ret.), Chairman, International Space Station Advisory Committee.

HOW NOAA PROCURES DATA FOR WEATHER FORECASTING

Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing entitled "To Observe and Protect: How NOAA Procures Data for Weather Forecasting". Testimony was heard from Mary Kicza, Assistant Administrator, National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service, NOAA; Alexander MacDonald, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Research Laboratories and Cooperative Institutes, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, NOAA; Berrien Moore, Dean, University of Oklahoma College of Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences, and Director, National Weather Center; and public witnesses.

PARTNERSHIP IN PROMOTING GROWTH OF LARGE AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Large and Small Businesses: How Partnerships Can Promote Job Growth". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled "A Review of the President's Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request for the Environmental Protection Agency". Testimony was heard from Nancy Stoner, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, Environmental Protection Agency; and Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency.

REEVALUATING THE TRANSITION FROM SERVICE MEMBER TO VETERAN

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled "Reevaluating the Transition from Service Member to Veteran: Honoring a Shared Commitment to Care for Those Who Defend Our Freedom". Testimony was heard from John Medve, Office of VA–DOD Collaboration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Jim Neighbors, Director, Requirements and Strategic Integration, Department of Defense; LTG James Terry Scott USA (Ret.), Chairman, Advisory Committee on Disability Compensation; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a markup of H.R. 3670, to require the Transportation Security Administration to comply with the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; H.R. 4048, the "Improving Contracting Opportunities for Veteran-Owned Small Businesses Act of 2012"; H.R. 4051, the "TAP Modernization Act of 2012"; and H.R. 4072, the "Consolidating Veteran Employment Services for Improved Performance Act of 2012". The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 3670; H.R. 4051, H.R. 4072. The following bill was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4048.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 9, the "Small Business Tax Cut Act". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies—2012: Committee announced the following membership: Senator Schumer (Chairman), Senator Reid, Senator Alexander, Representative Boehner, Representative Cantor, and Representative Pelosi.

Also, Committee approved its budget.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2012

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Agriculture, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Frank Kendall III, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, James N. Miller, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Policy, Erin C. Conaton, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Jessica Lynn Wright, of Pennsylvania, and Katharina G. McFarland, of Virginia, both to be an Assistant Secretary, and Heidi Shyu, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Business meeting to consider the nominations of Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, and Jeremy C. Stein, of Massachusetts, both to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Jeremiah O'Hear Norton, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Richard B. Berner, of Massachusetts, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, and Christy L. Romero, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, both of the Department of the Treasury; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine developing the framework for safe and efficient mobile payments, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: To hold hearings to examine current and near-term future price expectations and trends for motor gasoline and other refined petroleum fuels, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Nigeria, focusing on security, governance, and trade, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: To hold hearings to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fee agreements, focusing on strengthening FDA and the medical products industry for the benefit of patients, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine contractors, focusing on how much they are costing the government, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Business meeting to consider S. 2159, to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program through fiscal year 2017, and the nominations of Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, William J. Kayatta, Jr., of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Robin S. Rosenbaum, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Gershwin A. Drain, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, John Thomas Fowlkes, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Kevin McNulty and Michael A. Shipp, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Stephanie Marie Rose, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa, and Gregory K. Davis, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: To hold hearings to examine S. 2219, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, 10 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2013 for the Small Business Administration, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing on Security Challenges in Latin America, 8:30 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Management Issues Panel, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request for Intelligence Community, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2013 Budget Issues for Public Witnesses, 9 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies, hearing on FY 2013 Budget Request Pacific Command/Korea, 10:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on oversight of U.S. Naval Vessel Acquisition Programs and Force Structure of the Department of the Navy in the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on What Is the Price of Energy Security: from Battlefields to Bases, 11:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled "Balancing Privacy and Innovation: Does the President's Proposal Tip the Scale?", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Semi-Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau", 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, hearing entitled "Assessing China's Role and Influence in Africa", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, hearing entitled "The Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Health Affairs", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet, hearing on H.R. 1946, the "Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2011", 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 1917, the "Joint Ventures for Bird Habitat Conservation Act of 2011"; H.R. 1960, the "North American Wetlands Conservation Extension Act of 2011"; and H.R. 3074, the "Cormorant Management and Natural Resources Protection Act", 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following: H.R. 1241, the "Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area Establishment Act"; H.R. 1818, the "Mt. Andrea Lawrence Designation Act of 2011"; H.R. 2984, the "Maine Coastal Islands Wilderness Act of 2011"; and H.R. 4234, the "Grazing Improvement Act of 2012", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense, and Foreign Operations, hearing entitled "Are Changes in Security Policy Jeopardizing USAID Reconstruction Projects and Personnel in Afghanistan?", 8:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing entitled "Federally Funded Research: Examining Public Access and Scholarly Publication Interests", 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability and Memorial Affairs, hearing on the following: H.R. 4142, the "American Heroes COLA Act"; H.R. 4114, the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012"; H.R. 2051, the "Veterans Missing in America Act of 2011"; H.R. 2498, the "Veterans Day Moment of Silence Act"; H.R. 2377, the "Rating and Processing Individuals' Disability Claims Act"; H.R. 2717, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one city in the United States each year as an 'American World War II City', and for other purposes; and H.R. 4168, the "Caring for the Fallen Act", 10 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on individual and employer mandates in the Democrats' health care law, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2230, Paying a Fair Share Act. At approximately 11:30 a.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 2204, Oil Tax Subsidies Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill. Also, the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 2204 will be at 10:30 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 29

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H. Con. Res. 112—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022. Consideration of H.R. 4281—To provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

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*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. 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.