



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2011

No. 56

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 2, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 15, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK KINGSTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: A personal "Te Deum":

You are God; we praise You.
You are the Lord; we acclaim You.
You are the eternal Father;
All creation worships You.
Save Your people, Lord, and bless Your inheritance.

Govern and uphold these now and always.

Day by day we bless You.
We praise Your name forever.
Keep us today, Lord, from all sin.
Have mercy on us, Lord have mercy.
Lord, show us Your love and mercy;
For we put our trust in You.
In You, Lord, is our hope;
And we shall never hope in vain.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. POE of Texas. 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 pro tempore. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OUR CHAPLAIN, DANIEL COUGHLIN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our House Chaplain, Father Daniel Coughlin, is retiring from his duties after 11 years of serving the United States House of Representatives.

Since our forefathers established this tradition in Congress in 1789, the House Chaplain has provided spiritual guidance, hope, and heavenly blessings through prayer every day.

Each new day, Father Coughlin enters the House Chamber with his happy Irish spirit and a twinkle in his eyes, and prays to the Almighty so that Members will walk humbly and wise in the Lord's sight. Father Coughlin has been here during the troubling days of 9/11, during good times, and times that aren't so good.

Father Coughlin, from Chicago, has been ordained for 50 years, and has found time to be an angel to the poor in Calcutta, India, where he lived with members of Mother Teresa's community. Over the years, this House has needed Father Coughlin's guidance, for, after all, you have to be in good with the Lord to pray for politicians every day.

□ 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.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2859

My prayer for Father Coughlin is that he continues to be a blessing to our Nation and to the people he encounters who need spiritual help—and as he often says when ending his prayers—“both now and forever.”

And that’s just the way it is.

THE REPUBLICAN MISINFORMATION MISSION

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

Mr. LEVIN. We’ve heard your last prayer, Father Dan. We wish you the best. You have served us very well.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor last night, and I heard the debate. Clearly, there is a massive misinformation mission on the part of the Republicans.

I heard repeatedly that they want to save Medicare. No. They want to end it with a voucher, costing seniors in the future at least \$6,000 a year. They say they want to preserve the safety net. No. They want to shred it.

According to nonpartisan analysis, their proposal calls for spending on items other than Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid—but including defense—to fall from 12 percent of GDP last year to 6 percent in 2022 and just 3.5 percent of GDP in the long run. We are not going to shred defense. What their proposal means in shredding the safety net is that they have become radicals instead of conservatives.

THE PRESIDENT STILL STANDS FOR THE TAX MAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Father Dan Coughlin, for your service.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans know, today is the annual Tax Day, April 15. I bring this up because, finally, the President has joined in the discussion of our country’s dangerous deficits. On Wednesday, he announced his scheme to reduce the out-of-control deficits his administration promoted—raising taxes—proving yet again that liberals still look to the tax man to solve their inability to manage a budget.

Americans do not want this. The tea party is correct: taxed enough already, T-E-A. Raising taxes on small businesses does nothing but kill jobs while keeping unemployment levels above 9 percent.

Liberals miss the point: The Federal Government does not have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. Cutting spending and borrowing needs to be the topic of discussion. Raising taxes does not.

House Republicans continue to lead the way to limit spending. Courageous Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN has presented a commonsense plan which brings current reckless spending under control.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF NATIONAL GUARDSMAN SPE- CIALIST DENNIS POULIN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor National Guardsman Specialist Dennis Poulin, a recently fallen hero of our country.

Dennis “Danny” Poulin, a 26-year-old native of Cumberland, Rhode Island, gave his life for our Nation, on Thursday, March 31, 2011, while serving in Afghanistan.

He, like so many of our brave men and women in uniform, executed the mission in Afghanistan with dedication and extraordinary competence. Specialist Poulin certainly did all we asked of him. This brave young man served our country with honor and made the ultimate sacrifice. He served as a mortarman in the Guard’s Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 181st Infantry Regiment.

I want to take a moment to recognize Specialist Poulin’s parents and family and to thank them for his service to our country. Besides his parents, Doris Poulin and Richard Renau, Specialist Poulin leaves his son, Nikolous Cullen Poulin; fiancée, Ashley Shylene Simon; two sisters, Jennifer Poulin and Angelique Renau; and extended family, all who mourn his loss.

Let us honor his life, service and sacrifice, and let us help those who mourn by joining together in thanks for Specialist Poulin’s valor and courage on behalf of our great Nation. All who knew him, and those who didn’t but who know the sacrifice he has made, will miss him and will remain grateful for his service to our country.

BANKRUPTCY OR PROSPERITY

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. I too would like to join in the chorus we’ve heard today to thank Father Coughlin for bearing the cross that is Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we hear the debates that will continue on into today on the budget, we will hear much hue and cry; but when we look at the reality, the Ryan House Republican proposal is really a very modest attempt to sustain the welfare state, and I believe it is an important one.

When history looks back after the momentous changes in which we find ourselves, it will view the Ryan House Republican budget as but a baby step in escaping Big Government’s implosion. It is a responsible course; it is a responsible choice because it is between bankruptcy or prosperity; and I and the American people will choose prosperity.

□ 0910

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I join the chorus of those thanking Father Coughlin for his service and dedication and wishing him well.

I also rise today in observance of the National Day of Silence.

Today is the 14th year we have commemorated the National Day of Silence, a time when students across the country remain silent for the whole day to draw attention to discrimination toward their LGBT peers.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and questioning youth and their allies face verbal and physical bullying on a daily basis just for being who they are, for expressing their sexuality, or for demonstrating a non-normative gender identity. I am proud that my constituents are calling for a stop to this harassment, and I encourage all Americans to join them.

Our Nation is at her best when we are celebrating our differences, not punishing individuals for being different. I am proud to say that in my district Queer Youth and allies work together to make life better for queer youth. Middle schools and high schools in my district host student-run Gay-Straight Alliances, which create a supportive space so that queer youth do not feel isolated. My district also hosts Queer Youth conferences and award events that celebrate our queer youth.

Though many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender advocates and straight allies are silent today, we in Congress must never be silent.

CONSUMER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, JIM MATHESON and I introduced H.R. 1528, the Consumer Privacy Protection Act. Our legislation attempts to strike the proper balance between consumer privacy and innovation by requiring entities to provide consumers, in clear and easy to understand language, what information is being collected and how the information is being used. By giving the consumer more notice and choice, we can encourage strong Internet commerce while protecting consumer privacy.

Overreaching privacy regulations could have a significant, negative economic impact at a time when many small businesses are struggling today. Only the consumer knows how he or she feels about the information being collected, the parties doing the collecting, and the purpose for which the information is collected. Congress cannot and should not make that decision for them. We need to place the control

over consumer information with the actual consumer, and our legislation does this.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH WORKERS AT EAST MILLINOCKET PAPER MILL

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the people of the Katahdin region in my home State of Maine.

The paper mill in East Millinocket is shutting down and taking with it hundreds of jobs and much of the tax base. Like so many other mills and factories across this country, it couldn't keep its doors open.

In the last decade, our Nation has lost nearly 6 million manufacturing jobs and seen 50,000 factories closed. It's because we haven't prioritized our manufacturing sector and haven't made an effort to keep good-paying, blue collar jobs in the United States.

I worked at this mill for over 29 years alongside the hardworking people of the Katahdin region. In solidarity, I stand with them today, confident that if we are pulling together, we can find a way to put this mill back online.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to help me and workers in Maine and all across this country by supporting a national manufacturing strategy and a new trade policy.

PUTTING OUR COUNTRY ON THE PATH TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by recognizing Father Coughlin and his service and sacrifice to our Nation.

As we look at this Nation today, we are at a tipping point, and we have two paths that we can choose. We can choose to talk in a meaningful and thoughtful way about the deficits we have before us in this national debt, or we can continue to demagogue issues and ideas that will get us to long-term prosperity for this country. I know the American people prefer us to have that thoughtful, meaningful conversation about how we get this Nation on the right path, how we rein in spending, and how we control the growth of government.

Folks, today the issues are about growing our economy, not about growing government. We have seen that past efforts to grow government have not resulted in prosperity for this Nation. The time is now for us to have a meaningful, thoughtful discussion about all aspects of the budget. Let's not demagogue the issue. Let's prove to the American people that we can make the tough decisions to move this Nation in the right direction, to get

this spending under control, to reduce our debt, and make sure the long-term care of this country is put first and foremost, that we are on the path to prosperity.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to thank Father Coughlin, Father Dan, for his spiritual sustenance and guidance that he has given all the Members of the House during his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to commemorate the 96th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide, which was the first genocide in the 20th century and, sadly, the template for a cycle of genocide that continues to this day around the world.

Next week, in Fresno and around the country, there will be thousands of Armenian Americans, many who are sons and daughters and grandchildren of the survivors of the Armenian genocide. As a young man, I grew up listening to my friends the Kezirians, the Kolligians, the Bakers, the Abrahams, the Karabians and the Kashians, and many others who told the story of their parents and grandparents.

We are quickly approaching the 100th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide. I am hopeful we don't have to wait until then to bring justice to the Armenian nation and our friends and neighbors who sadly recognize that event.

There is never a right time to recognize genocide. More than 90 years have passed since the start of these events, and we cannot wait for a convenient moment to recognize this truly catastrophic historical event. I will continue to stand for us to properly recognize this tragic event.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 34.

□ 0917

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. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, with Mr. KINGSTON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, April 14, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112-62 by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on that amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 303, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—103

- Ackerman, Andrews, Baca, Baldwin, Bass (CA), Becerra, Berman, Blumenauer, Brady (PA), Brown (FL), Butterfield, Capuano, Carnahan, Carson (IN), Castor (FL), Chu, Cicilline, Clarke (MI), Clarke (NY), Cleaver, Clyburn, Cohen, Conyers, Crowley, Cummings, Davis (IL), DeLauro, Deutch, Doyle, Edwards, Ellison, Engel, Farr, Fattah, Filner, Frank (MA), Fudge, Garamendi, Gonzalez, Green, Al Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hanabusa, Hastings (FL), Hirono, Holt, Honda, Hoyer, Jackson (IL), Jackson Lee, Johnson, E. B., Kaptur, Kildee, Larson (CT), Lee (CA), Lewis (GA), Lujan, Lynch, McCollum, McDermott, McGovern, Miller (NC), Miller, George, Moore, Nadler, Napolitano, Neal, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor (AZ), Payne, Pelosi, Pingree (ME), Price (NC), Rangel, Richardson, Richmond, Rothman (NJ), Roybal-Allard, Rush, Sanchez, Linda T., Sarbanes, Schakowsky, Scott (VA), Scott, David, Serrano, Sewell, Sires, Slaughter, Sutton, Thompson (MS), Tierney, Tonko, Towns, Van Hollen, Velázquez, Wasserman, Schultz, Waters, Watt, Welch, Wilson (FL), Woolsey, Yarmuth

NOES—303

- Adams, Aderholt, Akin, Alexander, Altmire, Amash, Austria, Bachmann, Bachus, Barletta, Barrow, Bartlett, Barton (TX), Bass (NH), Berg, Biggert, Bilbray, Bilirakis, Bishop (NY), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Bonner, Boren, Boswell, Boustany, Brady (TX), Braley (IA), Brooks, Broun (GA), Buchanan, Bucshon, Buerkle, Burgess, Burton (IN), Calvert, Camp, Campbell, Canseco, Cantor, Capito, Capps, Cardoza, Carney, Carter, Cassidy, Chabot, Chaffetz, Chandler, Coble, Coffman (CO)

Cole	Jenkins	Posey
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (OH)	Quayle
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Quigley
Costa	Jones	Reed
Costello	Jordan	Rehberg
Courtney	Keating	Renacci
Cravaack	Kelly	Reyes
Crawford	Kind	Ribble
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rigell
Critz	King (NY)	Rivera
Cuellar	Kingston	Roby
Davis (CA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Davis (KY)	Kissell	Rogers (KY)
DeFazio	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DeGette	Kucinich	Rohrabacher
Denham	Labrador	Rokita
Dent	Lamborn	Rooney
DesJarlais	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Landry	Roskam
Dicks	Lankford	Ross (AR)
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Ross (FL)
Doggett	Latham	Royce
Dold	Latta	Runyan
Donnelly (IN)	Levin	Ruppersberger
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Duffy	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Duncan (TN)	Loeback	Scalise
Ellmers	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Emerson	Long	Schilling
Eshoo	Lowey	Schmidt
Farenthold	Lucas	Schock
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Schwartz
Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Schweikert
Fleischmann	E.	Scott (SC)
Fleming	Manzullo	Scott, Austin
Flores	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Marino	Sessions
Fortenberry	Matheson	Sherman
Foxx	Matsui	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Shuler
Gallely	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Gardner	McCaul	Simpson
Gerlach	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gibbs	McCotter	Smith (NJ)
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Gohmert	McKeon	Southerland
Goodlatte	McKinley	Speier
Gosar	McMorris	Stearns
Gowdy	Rodgers	Stivers
Granger	McNerney	Stutzman
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Sullivan
Green, Gene	Mica	Terry
Griffith (AR)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Guinta	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Guthrie	Moran	Tipton
Hall	Mulvaney	Tsongas
Hanna	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Harris	Neugebauer	Visclosky
Hartzler	Noem	Walberg
Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Walden
Hayworth	Nunes	Walsh (IL)
Heck	Nunnelee	Walz (MN)
Heinrich	Olson	Waxman
Heller	Owens	Webster
Hensarling	Palazzo	Weiner
Herger	Paul	West
Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Higgins	Pearce	Whitfield
Himes	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Holden	Perlmutter	Wittman
Huelskamp	Peters	Wolf
Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Womack
Hultgren	Petri	Woodall
Hunter	Pitts	Wu
Hurt	Platts	Yoder
Inslee	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Israel	Polis	Young (IN)
Issa	Pompeo	

NOT VOTING—26

Benishek	Graves (MO)	Meeks
Berkley	Hinchev	Merrick
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Olver
Bono Mack	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Clay	Langevin	Reichert
Culberson	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Stark
Garrett	Maloney	Young (AK)
Giffords	Markey	

□ 0941

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. HER-RERA BEUTLER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained, but had I voted I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was at a doctors appointment across town. Had I been present, I would have voted, “no.”

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, I missed rollcall vote No. 273. If I were here, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 2011, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 273. Had I voted I would have voted “no” on the Cleaver/Scott (VA) Amendment in the nature of a Substitute, rollcall 273.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) assumed the chair.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

H.R. 1473. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and the other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KINGSTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 112–62.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2012 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$3,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$3,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$3,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$4,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$4,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$4,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$4,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$5,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$5,309,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$358,000,000.

(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 2012: \$3,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$3,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$4,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$4,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$4,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$4,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$4,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$4,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$5,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$5,305,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$3,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$3,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$4,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$4,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$4,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$4,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$4,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$4,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$5,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$5,263,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$39,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$46,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$12,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –\$46,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$16,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$16,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$17,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$18,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$18,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$19,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$19,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$19,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,302,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,632,000,000.
 (6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$11,955,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,379,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$12,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$13,043,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$13,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$13,380,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$13,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$13,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$13,658,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$672,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$539,678,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$614,983,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$535,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$542,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$547,842,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$547,770,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$556,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$550,059,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$566,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$553,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$579,207,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$588,753,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$579,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$599,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$590,067,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$110,322,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,947,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,807,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,258,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,324,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,324,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,932,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,525,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,487,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,391,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,889,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,842,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,893,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,540,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,660,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,317,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,981,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,852,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,778,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,685,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,354,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,045,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,230,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,799,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,006,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,299,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,595,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,995,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,893,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,456,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,636,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,880,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,507,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,230,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,852,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,347,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,576,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,141,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,714,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,242,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,176,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,425,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,154,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,515,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,417,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,725,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,804,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,348,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,905,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,931,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,776,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,641,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,896,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,669,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,997,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,298,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,666,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,002,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,352,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,114,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,578,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,777,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,528,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,079,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$8,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,580,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,304,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$107,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,413,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$110,481,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$131,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$120,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$138,785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$125,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$135,799,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,935,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$137,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$133,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$139,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$135,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$141,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$137,422,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,871,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$162,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$137,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$156,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$157,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$150,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$154,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$136,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$145,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$138,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$139,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$138,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$138,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$140,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$139,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$133,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$136,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$130,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$132,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$127,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$129,047,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$391,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$372,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$403,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$396,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$481,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$464,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$535,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$529,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$580,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$588,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$624,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$629,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$666,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$663,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$706,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$706,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$759,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$747,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$800,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$798,972,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$484,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$483,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$526,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$526,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$555,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$555,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$578,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$578,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$624,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$624,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$648,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$647,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$672,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$672,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$734,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$735,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$787,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$787,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$840,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$840,674,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$604,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$576,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$584,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$576,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$538,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$536,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$519,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$522,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$520,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$525,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$515,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$516,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$519,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$513,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$525,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$526,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$531,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$531,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$539,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$539,155,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$54,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$54,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$55,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$55,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,979,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$162,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$156,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$158,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$158,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$157,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$157,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$151,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$152,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$157,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$157,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$153,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$153,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$147,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$147,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$157,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$156,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$160,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$160,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$164,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$163,950,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$79,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,187,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,477,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,562,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,922,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$371,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$426,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$426,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$490,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$490,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$546,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$546,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$599,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$599,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$642,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$642,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$675,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$675,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$696,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$696,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$714,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$714,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$718,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$718,317,000,000.
(19) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -\$77,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$77,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -\$80,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$80,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -\$81,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$81,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -\$84,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$84,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$91,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$91,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$97,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$97,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$105,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$110,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$110,174,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, the budget substitute that we have before you, the people's budget, is an honest document consistent with our country's values and our country's desires.

The people's budget does not tell the American people what they want to hear; it gives the American people what they want: Fairness, protection of our social net for Americans in retirement and at the beginning of their lives, jobs, an immediate infusion of job creation to put people back to work, investments in education. And this budget is balanced by 2021, the deficit is eliminated. It is the only budget that accomplishes that that is before you today.

It does not balance the budget on the backs of the middle class, those who aspire to be in the middle class, and those that are vulnerable in our society.

It reverses a practice and it taxes those corporations and the very, very 2 percent rich in this country so they pay their just sacrifice to keeping this country healthy and turning our country around.

We end the wars that are draining our national Treasury and our people. The Progressive Caucus listened to the American people, and the people's budget is what they want.

I urge approval of this budget. It is a document that represents the very best of what the people need, and it represents a departure from a practice that has brought us to the brink of a deep recession, to a practice that has brought us to joblessness across this country and to a practice that has given the privileged all they want and transferred that responsibility to working Americans in this country.

Our budget is a document that is honest, it is straightforward and merits your support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. The "people's budget"? This budget, if enacted, would end this country as we know it. This budget increases spending, Mr. Chairman, by \$13 trillion over 10 years. It takes \$16 trillion more from the American people over 10 years through the biggest tax increase this country has ever seen. It increases our debt \$3.5 trillion over 10 years.

This isn't the people's budget. This country was founded on equal opportunity for everyone, not equal out-

come. History is littered with countries and nations that have failed because they tried for equal outcome.

This country remains the greatest Nation the world has ever seen because we pride ourselves and enforce equal opportunity.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I am honored to get a chance to comment. I am very grateful we have an honest dialogue back and forth on different options.

This is a unique moment for us as a Nation to be able to look at the direction of our country and at the way we are going to do budgeting, and I have great respect for those that will come and say let's look at other ideas, and I think that's how we should come to the table. Both the President, the Senate, and the House should be coming and saying, here are the options, here are the voices, because there are different voices in America that have different perspectives, and I think that's a good, healthy debate.

Now, there are several areas that we will disagree on with this budget. We do agree that we should be working on deficit reduction. We do agree that debt is a serious problem in our Nation and we need to be able to work it down. It's how to do that.

The budget that's being presented here, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, does tax heavily those that are wealthy, but it also has a burden that's on those most vulnerable as well. And let me give you an example of that: It increases the transportation tax, that gas tax.

It not only adds an excise tax on gas companies, energy companies, so that the tax goes up, but it also adds 25 cents per gallon to the actual gas tax, and then at this time removes any other tax subsidies that are being piled on to any energy company. All those together are going to add a significant amount per gallon at the pump, beginning with just the basic option that's there of adding 25 cents. In addition, their recommendation is 43.4 cents for the gas tax itself.

That is clearly a tax that's going to hit very hard on those that are most vulnerable in our society, the people that are driving to work, that are moms commuting back and forth. I think that's the wrong direction to go. That's such a large tax on a group of people that are vulnerable.

So we do want to deal with the nature of our great deficits and of our great debt, but I don't think we need to be able to add that additional tax burden on the people that are very vulnerable.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I encourage the gentlemen at their next opportunity, the gentlemen across the aisle, to explain to the American taxpayer why they have to pay thousands of dollars on Tax Day when GE didn't have to pay a single cent and, in fact, got money back on Tax Day. Our budget is about shared sacrifice.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

□ 0950

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, there is one proposed budget that ends the war in Afghanistan, cuts Cold War-era weapons systems, completely eliminates the deficit within 10 years and aligns the Tax Code with the values of working families. And that's the people's budget submitted by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Instead of taking away health care from seniors by gutting Medicare, the people's budget provides more affordable health care with a robust public option that would save this Nation's taxpayers \$68 billion over 7 years.

The majority's budget will cost Americans 1.7 million jobs over the next 3 years. Our budget puts America back to work with badly needed investments in transportation, infrastructure, and a 21st-century education system.

We have a choice. The majority budget which demands more sacrifice from struggling families and gives the wealthy a free ride; or the progressive budget which invests in people, creates a budget surplus, and brings our troops home.

I urge my colleagues, make a smart, fiscally responsible choice. Vote for the people's budget.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the chairman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the opportunity to stand and speak against the Progressive Caucus budget because it is a budget that, once again, will spend too much money.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we have heard from the American people is this: they are tired of the Federal Government spending taxpayer money for programs they don't want and spending money that they don't have. And it is time for us to put this fiscal house in order.

Now, quite frankly, I think that today is a really great day. When we get to the end of this legislative day and the end of this legislative week, we will have passed the Ryan budget, which turns an enormous corner for our Nation. Over the next 10 years, it will reduce spending not by millions and billions, but by trillions—\$6.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Those are the kinds of first steps that the American people are wanting to see. That's the kind of fiscal responsibility that the American people are holding us accountable for: controlling spending, limiting spending, and making certain that there is a stable and secure environment in which economic growth and job creation can take place.

They have spoken loudly and clearly. And they have said reduce what you are spending, get your fiscal house in order, begin to focus not on the next 6 weeks or 6 months but the next 60 years, and focus on our children and

our grandchildren, making certain that we are not tapping their futures and trading it to the nations that hold our debt. I think that it's so important that we begin to arrest this and get it under control and to pass the Ryan budget today.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished cochair of the Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the point was made earlier that the Progressive Caucus' budget, which addresses a gas tax, is somehow not a good thing to deal with our Nation. But the infrastructure needs of our country, over \$3 trillion—according to the Society of Engineers, says that we need \$3 trillion in infrastructure spending.

Let's do something and put America back to work by rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our cochairs, Congressmen ELLISON and GRIJALVA, for their tremendous leadership.

Budgets are not just dollars and cents. They are moral documents that reflect who we are and what we believe in. The Republican budget is an assault on women, seniors, the underserved poor and low-income families. It's a shameless attempt to finance tax breaks for millionaires on the backs of the most vulnerable. The people's budget, however, offers a commonsense fiscally responsible plan that protects critical programs and services that millions of Americans depends on.

Our plan would eliminate the deficit in the next decade, put people back to work, and restore our economic competitiveness. In these difficult times, it includes additional funding for unemployment insurance to help those who've maxed out at 99 weeks to get additional benefits, recognizing there are five people to one job.

Our proposal eliminates the true drivers of our deficit, the unpaid-for Bush tax cuts and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it restates the law that no permanent bases will be built in Iraq. And we protect and preserve Medicare and Social Security for the future, and it includes a public option which saves money. The people's budget invests in our people, in our communities, and in our Nation.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

There has been a lot of talk about budgets being moral instruments. The budget that we've proposed through the Budget Committee, the Ryan budget, is a responsible budget. And let me say, Mr. Chairman, what is immoral is balancing these choices on the backs of our children and grandchildren, Americans who haven't even been born yet. That's what's immoral.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank Mr. ROKITA for the time.

I want to applaud my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus for doing something which I think is intellectually honest. In fact, I think if you look at a couple of budgets that we're going to be looking at over the next 2 days, the budget that the Budget Committee has offered, I think is a fair and honest representation of where the Republican Party is. The Republican Study Committee budget that we'll see in just a few minutes is a fair and honest representation of where the Republican Study Committee stands. And this budget, I think, is offered as a true and honest position, a policy statement, of where the progressives in this body and in this country stand. And for that I thank them.

That being said, it's hard to imagine a document that is more different from our document. There are \$16 trillion worth of tax increases in this document. To the extent that the progressives do stand and are honest in their belief that taxing and spending is the way to fix the Nation, this document certainly does contain that.

All of the 2001, 2003 tax cuts, which we affectionately refer to around here as the Bush tax cuts, are gone, not just the ones on the highest income earners, everybody. This is a tax increase on almost everybody. In fact, it is a tax increase on everybody in the entire Nation. The top marginal rates under this proposal go from 45 percent up to 49 percent. The capital gains rate goes up to as high as 49 percent.

We introduced a new concept in this budget, apparently, the progressives do, that takes the estate tax to a progressive model, where you get estate tax rates that range from 45 percent up to 65 percent. We heard a few minutes ago, my colleague, Mr. LANKFORD, talk about the fact that there's a 25-cent gas tax increase in this particular document.

This is an avalanche of new taxes. At every single turn, the motivation behind the progressives seems to be that the government needs more money, that the government needs more money and it is our obligation to give it to the government. And we simply, wholeheartedly, dismiss that idea.

But, again, I think it is nice for a change to have honest and open debate on an intellectual basis in this Chamber. I thank the progressives for at least laying out where they stand. And I think it's a good process to go through. I think we'll have a chance later on today in just a few minutes to see where we stand as a Nation, at least as a body, here on these types of changes.

I very much hope that this amendment is defeated. I think that the Republican Budget Committee alternative is a better course of action. And I would like to see this amendment defeated.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I again yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I have a question for the gentleman: When does the Ryan budget create a surplus?

Mr. ROKITA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. The budget proposed and voted on by the committee—

Mr. ELLISON. I reclaim my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Do you want me to answer the question or not?

Mr. ELLISON. I will yield for an answer to the question, not for a filibuster.

□ 1000

Mr. ROKITA. With responsible, gradual reforms to the drivers of our debt, like Medicare and Social Security, the Ryan budget will balance.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I asked the gentleman when the Ryan budget created a surplus. He could have given me a year; he didn't. That's because he's probably embarrassed about when that is.

Let me tell you when the Progressive Caucus budget comes to surplus: 2021. That is known as a responsible budget. We are making a surplus by 2021. And by the way, that is Heritage Foundation mathematics. It's not \$16 trillion; it is \$3.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I see where the gentleman from Minnesota is going with his question, and I yield myself 10 seconds just to answer it.

He claims responsibility in this budget. The only way they can possibly balance, and I don't agree that they will balance in that time, is by drastically raising taxes on every American. That's not responsibility because it doesn't pose a choice. That is the definition of irresponsibility, Mr. Chairman.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have a chart before me, and I hope everyone will look at it. It is based on Congressional Budget Office numbers. If you go to fiscal year 2001, you'll see that we enjoyed a \$128 billion surplus. At that time we had a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Democrat President. Then if you'll notice, looking at the bottom, that we had a Republican Congress and a Republican President, and we had the beginning of a series of deficits, \$158 billion in FY 2002, which was immediately after the 9/11 and the ramp-up as a result of our efforts to protect Americans from terrorism.

Then we go to FY '03, '04, '05, '06 and '07, you can see how the deficits have increased to a peak of \$413 billion, but then the Republicans start getting things back under control. \$161 billion is the deficit that America suffered in FY 2007, and that's not good. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons I was dissatisfied with the George Bush administration is because of these deficits.

But let's look at what happened after the elections in November of 2006 in which NANCY PELOSI became House Speaker and HARRY REID became majority leader of the United States Senate. These deficits, which we were getting under control, in FY '08, \$459 billion; in FY '09, we almost go off the chart, \$1.4 trillion. Then we lose the White House. The Democrats are in total control. In FY '10, a deficit of \$1.3 trillion. In FY '11, a projected deficit of 1.6 or \$1.5 trillion, depending upon who you pay attention to.

Folks, we are here today forcing this issue because America is at risk. We are at risk of insolvency and bankruptcy because the * * * Members of this body choose to spend money that we do not have. They believe in wealth transfer programs.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend.

The gentleman from Minnesota will state his point of order.

Mr. ELLISON. I would like the gentleman's words taken down for the reference to certain Members of this body as socialists.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Alabama will please take his seat.

The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the particular use of one word that the folks on the other side of the aisle have objected to.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Without objection, the word is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, we all know what we're talking about here, and we all know what the definitional terms are, and I am more than happy to resume this discussion off the House floor. But for whatever reason, I'm not permitted to use one word.

Having said that, you can look at this chart and you can see the kind of deficits that we have sustained over the last 4 years, and the threat that this poses to the United States of America.

Now, this Progressive people's budget, I submit to you, is nothing more than a Trojan horse. There is an old saying: Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Why should anyone believe that the folks who have racked of these massive deficits that put America at risk are now going to change their stripes?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withdrawing the word "socialist" from his commentary.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman and Members, the gentleman from Alabama evidently has amnesia. Clinton administration eliminated the deficit and left a balanced budget. It was the Bush administration that created the deficit.

I rise in strong support for this, the Progressive Caucus alternative balanced people's budget. During the last administration, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle maxed out our Nation's credit card for wars and tax cuts for the rich, all the while saying deficits don't matter. Now they are using our deficit crisis as a rationale to undermine programs that they have never supported and push a divisive social agenda that is a sideshow to our budget debate.

Mr. Chairman, this country is not broke. We have spent our money on wars and tax credits for the very rich, and now it is time to entertain the people's budget, a balanced budget.

The Ryan budget breaks our promise to these American families by expecting them to bear the entire burden of deficit reduction, neglecting the fact that just 4 months ago my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle insisted on \$80 billion in tax cuts for the richest 2 percent of individuals in this country.

This is a balanced budget. I ask my colleagues to support this very responsible, balanced budget.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

□ 1010

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one to stand silent in the face of injustice. Today, I see before us one of the greatest betrayals in American history—the betrayal of our seniors and the disabled who rely on Medicare for their health care. We have made a social compact with our seniors, and the Republican budget breaks that compact. It is a disgrace and a shame.

Where is our sense of fairness? Where is our outrage? We can and we must do better.

Republicans head down a very dangerous path. We cannot, we must not, and we will not balance our budget on the backs of people who can least afford it. Our seniors, the disabled, the poor, the hungry—they have done nothing wrong. They do not deserve to bear the burden of these budget cuts.

Support and vote for the people's budget. It is the right budget, it is fair, and it is just.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. My heart pains me for this day and this

budget for America. Some of us might feel as the President does, that it's a question of whether or not we are saying to the American people that they are not understanding, or that we who are fighting simply are stupid.

It's a time when you want to reflect on how great a country we live in, and it hurts my heart when I see individuals putting on the floor of the House a budget that unfairly targets low-income communities and senior citizens while protecting the wealthiest Americans, Americans who I care about, and simply eliminating any sense of responsibility for working and middle class Americans.

The people's budget saves Medicare. Those are working Americans. Those are Americans that are middle class. And then, of course, what about our disabled persons? Do you think that they are only classified as low-income? These are individuals who become seniors or disabled who need to have the kind of sacrifice. Look what happens. The people's budget protects those who cannot protect themselves.

Finally, I ask the individuals, is there any shared sacrifice that you can see in the Republican budget. The Republican budget fails to help all those who are in need? This is a good budget. Support the people's budget.

Recommendation from CPC:

Every Member mentions the first talking point below re: deficits. Then Members can address the remaining TPs below, as they feel comfortable.

Deficit: Our Budget Eliminates the Deficit by 2021.

We eliminate the deficit by 2021. Instead of eroding America's hard-earned retirement plan and social safety net, our budget targets the true drivers of deficits in the next decade: the Bush Tax Cuts, the wars overseas, and the causes and effects of the recent recession.

Jobs: Our Budget Puts America Back to Work & Restores America's Competitiveness.

We rebuild America and make it competitive again. We make smart investments. We put America back to work. You can't grow the economy by slashing programs. Our plan will spark new job growth, improve education, accelerate clean energy development and modernize the nation's infrastructure.

Taxes: Our Budget Implements a Fair Tax System.

We ask the richest and most fortunate Americans to contribute more. We stop giving handouts and huge tax giveaways to corporate special interests. The "People's Budget" implements a fair tax system, based on the notion that fairness and equality are integral to our society. Our budget restores fairness to a system that unfairly benefits a few while hurting the majority of Americans.

Defense: Our Budget Brings Our Troops Home.

We bring the troops back home. We ensure that our country's defense spending does not continue to contribute significantly to our current fiscal burden. It's time to stop bankrupting the country fighting unwinnable wars. We end these wars not simply to save massive amounts of money or because the majority of Americans favors it, but because these wars are making America less safe, reduce our

standing in the world, and do nothing to reduce America's burgeoning energy security crisis.

Health: Our Budget Keeps Americans Healthy.

We allow real competition in health care. We will never see health care costs decrease until the government can compete and use its bargaining power to strike a better deal for Americans.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arizona has 6¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We have been greeted with a Republican budget that is a profoundly negative view of the future, and you've heard some of the reasons. I want to focus on just one. It doesn't just ignore the infrastructure deficit of an America that is falling apart—over \$2 trillion of unmet needs as referenced by my friend from Minnesota. It makes it worse. A 31 percent cut in already inadequate funding for national infrastructure. The Progressive Budget hears the needs of the American public and actually agrees with the truckers, the U.S. Chamber, local governments, AAA of America, indeed, the deficit commission, all suggested that, for the first time since 1993, we raise the gas tax.

My Republican friends have lost track of their Republican roots, for Republicans used to believe in infrastructure. Lincoln. Eisenhower. Eisenhower raised the gas tax. Even Reagan raised the gas tax. This progressive budget is a profound investment in infrastructure. It will put millions to work renewing and rebuilding America.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, the people's budget contains a provision for infrastructure development and the National Infrastructure Bank. I want to agree wholeheartedly with Congressman BLUMENAUER. We can not only put America back to work but we can strengthen the infrastructure that will make it safe to go across a bridge. We cannot neglect the bridges and the roads, the high-speed optical fiber cables and all these things that our country needs for a 21st century infrastructure. It's a jobs program. The people's budget is talking about jobs.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the people's budget.

I heard mention that our country was based on the goal of equal opportunity. Yes. But what about "and justice for all"? That is in our Pledge of Allegiance. We pledge that on the floor of this House every single day. This budget is not justice for all.

I was visited by advocates from Hawaii, eighth graders, who support funding for the disabled, for the blind, for our seniors. They were astounded by the anti-people priorities in the Ryan budget.

A budget has to be fair. That means the multi-millionaires in our country have to pay their fair share. That means the oil industry that's making money hand over fist, getting billions of dollars, has to pay their fair share. That means the companies that ship our jobs overseas have to pay their fair share.

Then we can invest in the future. That means education, energy self-sufficiency, infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to vote for this people's budget. Aloha.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. I rise to support the people's budget. It will create millions of jobs and turn the deficit into a surplus in 10 years. Republicans have unveiled their 2012 Road to Ruin budget, but instead of focusing on creating jobs, Republicans are ripping the bandage off our economy before the scar has even healed.

The people's budget focuses on real solutions. Instead of billion-dollar handouts to Big Oil, we're investing in job creation and loans for higher education. Instead of ending Medicare as we know it, we keep our promise of secure health care for seniors. Instead of giving more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, we're committed to tax relief for the middle class.

We must eliminate the deficit, but we must do it responsibly, and that means taking the Republican target off the backs of working families.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Progressive Caucus substitute budget. One of the concerns I have as an American citizen and a small business owner for 30 years is this document right here. This is the Internal Revenue Code. It is 9,959 pages long. This plan that is offered up today will add hundreds if not thousands of pages of additional complexity.

Recently, we all heard about a large U.S. corporation that had billions of dollars in profits and paid zero taxes. Mr. Chairman, the reason they were able to do that is because their attorneys knew what was buried in this document. Do we really need to make it more complicated and more complex? I think not.

I also oppose this because they talk about the benefits to lower income Americans. Yet by removing the 2001 and 2000 tax credits and tax rates and returning them to their previous levels, you will increase on the poorest Americans from 10 percent to 15 percent, a full 50 percent increase in their tax rates. On top of it, small business

owners will see their tax rates go to 45 percent.

Think of the small business owner in northeast Wisconsin, who will also pay an 8 percent State income tax, will pay a 5 or 6 percent sales tax, will pay 50 cents a gallon gasoline tax, will pay property tax, will pay FICA tax, will pay Social Security tax. I'm beginning to wonder if all they will do in their life is pay taxes.

I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

□ 1020

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself 10 seconds.

If I may, I have a simple inquiry for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

As part of the fairness in our Tax Code, I would like to ask, is it fair that, let's say, Warren Buffett should pay a lower income tax rate than his receptionist? Is that fairness in our Tax Code?

Mr. RIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RIBBLE. I would concur that it's not fair.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Congressman RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

This substitute budget is listed as the "Progressive budget." For reasons that clearly anyone can take a deep breath and see, as opposed to what Mr. RYAN is presenting to us as Republican, this is really what our country is all about: building on the great things that we've done and making certain that the young people who follow us will be able to say that we have improved their opportunities.

Make no mistake about it: Borrowing trillions of dollars and paying interest on that money puts us in a very bad economic position, not only in our country, but throughout the world. I assume that none of us here wants to spend a lot of time pointing fingers at each other about how we got to be where we are.

One thing is abundantly clear: If America is going to be progressive, it has to find a progressive solution in order to get out of that.

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

The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has the right to close.

Mr. ROKITA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive budget substitute.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, budgets are more than collections of numbers; they are a statement of our values. The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget is a reflection of the values and priorities of working families in this country. Our budget charts a path that keeps America exceptional while addressing the most pressing problems facing the Nation today.

Our budget eliminates the deficit and stabilizes the debt by 2021. It does this in a manner consistent with the aspirations of the American people. It does this by restoring our economic competitiveness so that we can all experience the fullest definition of the American Dream: that each of our children will do better than we did.

We did not set these goals arbitrarily. Our budget was crafted by listening to the American people. In poll after poll, they are telling us that they want us to preserve Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid; to make higher education more affordable; to expand job training programs; to invest in roads, research and, above all, in great schools for our children.

We can do all of these things and eliminate our deficit. We have a moral imperative to do so. The people's budget is fair; it is just; it is a step towards moving this debate back to the true center.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Progressive budget. It is the people's budget. Please vote for our amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROKITA. In closing, I would like to recall the words of the gentleman from South Carolina, who spoke about the honesty of this proposed amendment.

I think it was an appropriate thing to say. This is an honest proposal. I believe that the proponents of this amendment believe everything that's in the amendment as a possible solution—but honesty, Mr. Chairman, does not equal responsibility.

This isn't the people's budget that is being proposed. It is the "blank check" budget. You see, it doesn't force any choices. It spends \$13 trillion over 10 years. It taxes the American people. It has the Federal Government confiscate from the American people an additional \$16 trillion over 10 years. That's not forcing choices. That's not being responsible. Every family in this Nation understands, when they prepare their budgets, they have to make choices. There are different priorities. This just opens up by fiat the right of the Federal Government to dip into the wallets of every American.

I heard a lot about tax cuts for the rich, Mr. Chairman. I want to be clear that the budget that came out of the Budget Committee calls for revenue-neutral tax reform. We are motivated by the same reform principles that are in the President's fiscal commission: to broaden the tax base and to lower tax rates for everybody.

I was looking at some statistics. The bottom 50 percent of taxpayers pays less than 3 percent of the income taxes. In fact, 47 percent of individuals pay no Federal income tax whatsoever.

Our idea is tax neutral. It's revenue neutral. It lowers the tax rates for everybody. It makes all of us pay something, and it doesn't give tax cuts to the rich. We are planning to take away the loopholes so that those who are better off than we are can't take advantage of high-priced lobbyists.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposed amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal pulls a bait and switch on seniors, people with disabilities, the poor, and anyone who hopes to grow old with dignity in this country. It dismantles bedrock American programs—Medicare and Medicaid—and opens Social Security to future attack.

The Republican plan takes Medicare's promise of guaranteed health benefits and swaps it out for a voucher for private insurance—one that's intentionally structured to diminish in value. Seniors will be at the mercy of big insurance companies and left to pay bigger bills out-of-pocket.

The Republican plan changes Medicaid to a block grant program. States' funding will fall far short. They'll be forced to slash programs that now cover much-needed health care for kids, the poor, and the disabled.

The Republican plan is morally bankrupt and takes the most cynical view of our country's future. It says we should reward the wealthiest Americans and corporations with trillions in tax breaks and pay for them by slashing essential programs that work.

I applaud the President for attacking the Republican budget proposal and calling it what it is: a plan to reduce the deficit on the backs of our most vulnerable populations and middle class families.

We know there is a better, fairer way.

The People's Budget—put forth by the Congressional Progressive Caucus—works for all Americans and puts people back to work.

In contrast to the House Republican budget, it balances our budget in 10 years—while preserving Medicare, improving health reform, maintaining our commitment to education, and making the investments in our infrastructure that will create jobs.

It does so by ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and bringing sanity to our bloated defense budget.

Rather than destroying our safety net like the Republican budget does, the People's Budget ensures that the wealthiest Americans and Wall Street pay their fair share of taxes.

The People's Budget would end tax breaks for oil companies and corporations that ship jobs offshore, and it would require Wall Street to pay for the damage it did to our economy.

I recently sent a survey to my constituents asking how we should cut the deficit. The results show that 85 percent want to close loopholes benefiting Wall Street and corporations;

78 percent want the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy to end; and 64 percent want defense spending cut. In contrast, only 13 percent think we should cut domestic spending for education and children, and only 12 percent want cuts to Medicare or Social Security.

The People's Budget represents the priorities of my constituents and is the real path to prosperity. I'm proud to support it and urge all of my colleagues to do the same while voting no on the reckless Republican budget.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 216. An act to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and intentional violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the reappointment of Steve Zink of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-554, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) to the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation, vice the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission, vice the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KINGSTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 112-62.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2011 and for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Submission of reports on mandatory savings.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Restrictions on advance appropriations.

Sec. 302. Emergency spending.

Sec. 303. Changes in allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.

Sec. 304. Prohibition on using revenue increases to comply with budget allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 306. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.

Sec. 307. Budget discretionary accounts.

Sec. 308. Treatment of rescission bills in the House.

Sec. 309. Sense of the House regarding base-line revenue projections.

Sec. 310. Sense of the House regarding long-term budget projections.

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

Sec. 401. Earmark moratorium.

Sec. 402. Limitation of authority of the House Committee on Rules.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy statement on health care law repeal.

Sec. 502. Policy statement on bailouts of State and local governments.

Sec. 503. Policy statement on means tested welfare programs.

Sec. 504. Policy statement on reforming the Federal budget process.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2011: \$1,664,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$1,866,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,128,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: \$2,325,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,426,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,523,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,694,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,809,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$2,959,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,120,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,287,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: —\$0.

Fiscal year 2012: —\$25,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: —\$227,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: —\$346,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: —\$406,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: —\$448,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: —\$482,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: —\$527,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: —\$544,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: —\$561,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: —\$597,000,000,000.

(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 2011: \$2,961,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,617,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,502,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: \$2,540,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,624,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,744,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,808,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,862,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$2,975,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,067,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,154,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: \$3,117,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,740,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,673,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: \$2,650,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,706,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,818,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,872,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,919,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,038,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,131,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,219,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: \$1,453,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$874,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$545,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$325,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$280,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$295,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$179,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$111,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$78,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: –\$68,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: \$14,969,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$15,992,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$16,722,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$17,243,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$17,750,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$18,287,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$18,727,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,127,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,485,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$19,792,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,053,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: \$10,348,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,208,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$11,768,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,100,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$12,385,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$12,678,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$12,857,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$12,976,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$13,066,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$13,106,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$13,078,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2011 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$733,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$696,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$662,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$674,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$699,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$711,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$723,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, \$2,545,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,816,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,628,000,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (21) Global War on Terrorism and related activities (970):
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS
SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO SLOW THE GROWTH IN MANDATORY SPENDING AND TO ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION.—(1) Not later than September 15, 2011, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.
 (2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$436,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$103,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$3,007,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$49,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(E) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$18,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(F) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$28,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(G) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$320,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(H) SPECIAL RULE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may take into account legislation enacted after the adoption of this resolution that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable adjustments in reconciliation instructions, allocations, and budget aggregates and may also make adjustments in reconciliation instructions to protect earned benefit programs.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2011, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than \$4,163,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(c) REVISION OF ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON MANDATORY SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than September 15, 2011, all House committees shall identify savings amounting to one percent of total mandatory spending under its jurisdiction from activities that are determined to be wasteful, unnecessary, or lower-priority. For purposes of this section, the reports by each committee shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than September 15, 2011.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT
SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2014 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,565,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012.

SEC. 302. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (a)(2).

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (b).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (b) or subsection (c), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the 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.

SEC. 303. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b), that propose to change Federal revenues, the impact of such measure on Federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

(A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables; and

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under paragraph (1).

(b) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to

allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 304. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 306. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the “Budget Protection Mandatory Account”. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable section 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of

the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: “The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.”

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2008 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) “mandatory budget authority” means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 307. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the “Budget Protection Discretionary Account”. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee’s suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: “The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this

amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.”

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 308. TREATMENT OF RESCISSION BILLS IN THE HOUSE.

(a)(1) By February 1, May 1, July 30, and November 11 of each session, the majority leader shall introduce a rescission bill. If such bill is not introduced by that date, then whenever a rescission bill is introduced during a session on or after that date, a motion to discharge the committee from its consideration shall be privileged after the 10-legislative day period beginning on that date for the first 5 such bills.

(2) It shall not be in order to offer an amendment to a rescission bill except an amendment that increases the amount of budget authority that such bill rescinds.

(b) Whenever a rescission bill passes the House, the Committee on the Budget shall immediately reduce the applicable allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by the total amount of reductions in budget authority and in outlays resulting from such rescission bill.

(c)(1) It shall not be in order to consider any rescission bill, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, unless—

(A) in the case of such bill or conference report thereon, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet for at least 48 hours before its consideration; or

(B)(i) in the case of an amendment to such rescission bill made in order by a rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet within one hour after the rule is filed; or

(ii) in the case of an amendment under an open rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet immediately after being offered; in a format that is searchable and sortable.

(2) No amendment to an amendment to a rescission bill shall be in order unless germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

(d) As used in this section, the term “rescission bill” means a bill or joint resolution which only rescinds, in whole or in part, budget authority and which includes only titles corresponding to the most recently enacted appropriation bills that continue to include unobligated balances.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING BASELINE REVENUE PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its baseline revenue projections, the Congressional Budget Office should assume that any tax provision which is scheduled to expire under current law will be extended through the duration of any budget forecast by Congressional Budget Office so as to ensure that expiring tax provisions and expiring spending programs (other than direct appropriations) are treated in like fashion.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM BUDGET PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its ten-year and long-term budget projection reports, the

Congressional Budget Office should include an alternative scenario that assumes that mandatory spending programs grow at the same rate as average, projected nominal gross domestic product (GDP).

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 401. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit; or

(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this resolution, the terms “congressional earmark”, “limited tax benefit”, and “limited tariff benefit” have the meaning given those terms in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012.

(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—This resolution shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality, or congressional district.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The House Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in the first section of this resolution.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be repealed; and

(2) in its place, health care reform that empowers patients should be enacted.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BAILOUTS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal Government should not bailout State and local governments, including State and local government employee pension plans and other post-employment benefit plans.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(2) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately \$10 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(3) Today, there are currently 77 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) Taxpayers deserve clear and transparent information on how well these programs are working, and how much the Federal Government is spending on means-tested welfare.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President’s budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the

aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed so that it is easier to reduce Federal spending than it is to increase it by enacting reforms included in the Spending, Deficit, and Debt Control Act of 2009 (H.R. 3964, 111th Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1030

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Study Committee’s substitute that is now on the floor. This substitute amends and builds upon the great work of Chairman RYAN and the entire House Budget Committee.

And while I do come to the floor and support Chairman RYAN’s proposal, the RSC wanted to put forth a proposal on the floor today that went even a step further. We named our budget today the Honest Solutions budget because we know that what we are proposing will not be easy. Why? Because real solutions are not necessarily easy solutions. But given the dangerous conditions of our Nation’s fiscal situation, we must recognize that tough choices must be made and must be made now.

The RSC believes that we can do better than any of the budgets on the floor today. So we have a budget that will, first of all, ensure that our Nation spends responsibly by freezing total discretionary spending at 2008 levels. The RSC budget further ensures that our Nation’s security will be met by meeting Defense Secretary Gates’s defense request. The RSC budget puts nondefense discretionary spending on a sustainable path.

In addition, the RSC budget strengthens Medicare’s long-term finances. And most importantly, our budget, unlike any other budget on the floor today, will balance within our lifetime.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PASCARELL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I want to thank all the members of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. Chairman, for their work on this budget. I also want to thank Chairman

RYAN for the work on his budget and the committee's work there too, and in particular, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for their work in putting this together.

The RSC budget, as the gentleman from New Jersey has mentioned, keeps tax rates low because we believe in economic growth; starts the process of saving Medicare and Social Security; protects national defense, which, after all, is that area we are supposed to constitutionally spend taxpayer dollars on.

But most importantly, what the Republican Study Committee budget does is it balances. It does what every single family, ever single small business owner, every single State government and local government has to do: it actually puts forth a budget that balances, lives within your means, doesn't spend more than you take in, gets to balance within a definable period of time. That is why we think this is appropriate, particularly when you think about the fiscal situation our Nation is in.

So I stand here in support of the budget and commend the gentleman from New Jersey for the great work that he has done.

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

If the Republican budget is a doubling down on the policies that brought us to the brink, which is contained in this budget, my brother from New Jersey presents a budget which I think quadruples down on the economic policies and lack of optimism in the American people.

The budget believes we cannot, as President Kennedy said a little over 50 years ago, "bear any burden and meet any hardship" in order to better our Nation. That's what America is all about, regardless of your party persuasion.

This budget gives trillions in income tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans, we both agree on that—you think it's a good policy, we think it's a horrible policy—and at the same time cuts \$18 billion. Let me just take one example, the SCHIP program: \$18 billion cut to our children—our own children, our grandchildren. You must be kidding me. This budget gives trillions in estate breaks to the wealthiest Americans. Many people having estates pay no taxes, yet this slashes funding for Pell Grants for our kids, our grandchildren to go to college.

This budget gives trillions in tax breaks to corporations that have been shipping jobs overseas, but ask our constituents, in your district and my district and everybody's district, to take a 20 percent cut in the scheduled benefits to Social Security. It's easy to sit here as a Congressman waiting until you turn 70—why are you smiling?—to retire with benefits you've

earned, but you're asking this of our asphalt layers, our secretaries, and our teachers.

It comes down to a clear set of priorities, Mr. Chairman. If your priorities are to cut taxes for the wealthy on the backs of the retirees, then I think this second budget is the budget for you. But if you believe in an America that protects our seniors, our children, the disabled, our veterans, levels the playing field and invests in future generations, then I urge you to stand with us.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), who recognizes the fact that we must live within our means now and, unlike the gentleman from New Jersey, does not want to put additional burdens on future generations.

Mr. MULVANEY. To the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Chairman, I would say that it's not easy to do.

Why are we here? We're here for a single purpose: we take what the Republican Committee has done and simply lay out for the American people how hard it is to balance the budget within 10 years. It is not easy to do. But to sit and hear these onslaughts about how we're giving tax breaks—from a group of people that promised they would not raise taxes on folks who make less than \$250,000 and then repeatedly violated that promise over the course of the last 2 years—is simply hard to take.

This is the only budget that we will get a chance to vote on this week that both balances the budget within 10 years and does not raise taxes. We take what the Republican Committee has done, we build on it to show exactly how deep the hole is that we have dug for ourselves and how hard it is to get out. But to suggest that we do it on the backs of the poor is simply disingenuous.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is absolutely on target on most of these issues dealing with the budget as we move forward.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate my colleague's courtesy.

The words ringing in my ears for a moment about the Democrats having increased taxes, there is this collective amnesia on the side of our Republican friends who forget that a critical part of President Obama's Recovery Act that was passed by the last Congress—42 percent of which was tax cuts or relief—included a tax cut for every working American. The kind of forgot about that.

As a practical matter, Mr. Chairman, what we have done is to move forward under our initiative with something that will enable us to rebuild and renew America. What we have been given from our friends here with this alternative budget from my good friend from New Jersey which I do appreciate,

this is where the Republican Party wants to go.

The Ryan budget is bad enough. It will be dead on arrival in the Senate, and will be resoundingly rejected as Americans see what is happening, taking away the retirement, health care security of Americans—230 million Americans will be returned to the tender mercies of the private insurance market. Remember, the private insurance market didn't want to insure senior citizens in an affordable fashion with comprehensive coverage; that's why we had to have Medicaid in the first place. And now the trick is to provide a voucher to insurance companies, hoping that they will step up and fill the gap. When you look at how private insurance premiums have more than doubled in the last 10 years, you see what a hollow promise this is and what a serious problem it is going to be for American families trying to plan for their future.

This is the vision that we have from our Republican friends, not only take the Republican Budget Committee, go beyond it in terms of more benefits for those who need it the least.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who has no amnesia but recognizes the fact that we do no favor for this generation by putting the burden for future constraints on our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1040

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. This Nation is on a collision course with a sovereign debt crisis the magnitude of which has never been known to this country. This is not some moonless night on the Atlantic. We are barreling full speed toward that iceberg of debt in the full light of day, and we can all see it dead ahead.

The Ryan budget turns the ship around just enough to avoid hitting that iceberg. The RSC budget does it with an added safety margin by incorporating more of the debt commission's recommendations and implementing them faster.

Mr. Chairman, we know the challenge. We see the American dream at risk, and we know that we have but a fleeting moment in history to avoid the hardest times our Nation has ever known. We can act now, place our retirement systems on sound financial footings, arrest the debilitating spiral of debt that threatens the very survival of our Nation, and return our economy to the prosperity that it has known when it enjoyed what Jefferson called a wise and frugal government. Or we can continue on our present course until we crash into the ice cold and hard reality that we can all see dead ahead.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 3 minutes to the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, budgets are a reflection of our values and our priorities: jobs, economic growth, fiscal discipline, fairness, shared sacrifice. Most Americans talk about this all the time when they're at their kitchen table. It's not that difficult.

So quite honestly the question before us is not whether to reduce the deficit, but how. Budgets involve tradeoffs. The Republican budget that is presented to us today along with this Republican Study Committee alternative would say that we must continue the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans in this country. We must continue to give a millionaire about \$130,000 in tax cuts in this budget even though we are facing the largest deficits our country has experienced.

At the same time, the choice that this Republican budget makes is to say to seniors, We must end Medicare as we know it; we must eliminate the guarantee that you, as a senior, have had for more than 35 years under Medicare to choose your doctor and your hospital; and we must impose upon you an additional \$6,000 in health care costs because these deficits are so big.

So as the President said a couple of days ago, under the Republican budget, you would need to take 22 seniors paying 6,000 additional dollars to cover the costs of giving one millionaire in this country the \$130,000 tax cut. We must do that under the Republican budget.

Democrats have said we must not do that. We must do this differently. And we must invest again in our people.

On health care, we don't believe that Americans who are seniors should be given a coupon instead of a guarantee. But that's what the Republican budget does. It says, You're going to get a voucher, a coupon, essentially. Once you've used it, the extent of the value of that coupon, the rest of the money to pay for your health care, comes out of your pocket. That's why the President said 6,000 additional dollars for each senior under Medicare under the Republican plan. Coupon care instead of Medicare. That's what you must have under the Republican budget.

Democrats say we must invest in Medicare and find the cuts to get rid of the waste in Medicaid that we know exists. The duplication of services that seniors don't need. We can do this without denying seniors guaranteed benefits.

And finally, we must create jobs, but the Republican budget, most of the leading economists tell us, will cost us 1.7 million jobs. Not create. Cost us 1.7 million jobs. Under the Bush recession, 8 million Americans lost their job. The month that George Bush handed the keys to Barack Obama, we hemorrhaged nearly 800,000 jobs.

We must do this right. Reject the Republicans' budget proposal.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1

minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), who, just like the gentleman from California, understands that we must not sink the ship of state, as the other side of the aisle would do, by excessive tax burdens and debt.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You know what's great about being here today and talking about the Ryan plan is it's a blueprint. And blueprints you can do a couple things to. You can add to, and you can take away from.

And what we've heard from the progressives a minute ago is, plunder the people's plan rips the pages out of the future of this Nation for our children and our grandchildren. But the Republican Study Committee, it adds to it. It actually takes it a step further. It saves the taxpayers more money by providing savings starting with 2006 levels and going to 2008 levels.

But what we have to recognize is the debt and the deficit problems we have here today are not because we are taxed too little; it's because we have spent too much. And it is a result of 2 failed years of more government, more taxes, and more spending that we've seen. It's time to put that in history. Let's put it in the drawer.

Let's move on, and let's pass the Republican Study Committee plan because I can assure you this: It doesn't go where the President and the liberals of this House want to go, and that's into the wallets of the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan fiscal commission—no fringe group—said that the Republican plan was unbalanced because it doesn't ask for shared sacrifice. It's a lopsided approach. This budget takes us farther off the deep end.

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.)

Mr. ANDREWS. There is no question that the country has to reduce the deficit by restraining spending. That's why we favor having Medicare get the same deal on prescription drugs the VA does—which would save \$24 billion a year.

But there is a question about the future of Medicare. And today we're going to take a vote. Will Medicare prosper or perish? Will Medicare survive or die? That's the issue before the House today.

The fact is the Republican plan puts an insurance company between our seniors and their doctors—and that is wrong. The fact is that the Republican plan does not reduce health care costs. Hospitals will not charge less. Doctors will not charge less. The government will pay less, and seniors will pay more—\$6,000 per senior per year.

The fact is that this is all being done not to reduce the deficit, but to reduce taxes of the wealthiest people in America. The fact is we should not have this.

And the fact is this: We can have an America that doesn't have red ink in

its budget but does have Medicare for its seniors.

Let's make the choice that our constituents sent us here to make. Yes, let's sensibly reduce spending—as we did yesterday on a bipartisan basis. But this is the wrong time to end Medicare. We will fight this effort, and we will prevail.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the RSC budget because we cannot wait, as the other side seems to indicate, to get our fiscal house in order. And the RSC budget will put us on that path even faster.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of their tax dollars going to Washington, D.C., with nothing in return but empty promises and Federal strings. They are tired of adding to the National debt with none of the promised jobs.

People across my State of Kansas, indeed all across the country, want their power back from Washington. Our Founding Fathers got this concept of federalism right, and it's time we return government power from Washington bureaucrats and politicians back to the American people.

Block grants of Federal Medicaid dollars to the States will do just that by allowing States and those closest to the people to use their ingenuity and creativity to make Medicaid dollars work more effectively.

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

Mr. GARRETT. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. If we really care about the people, Mr. Chairman, there are currently 455 Medicaid waivers, and I ask that we allow the flexibility in the Medicaid system through a block grant system that returns the powers of federalism back to the States. And the RSC budget will do just that, Mr. Chairman. It's the right thing to do. It's the right time now to balance our budget in this way.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

□ 1050

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for this opportunity.

Unlike so many of my colleagues, I don't have any charts or anything to point out the direction in which I would want my great country to go, but I do have 40 young minds that come from the Frederick Douglass Academy, come from my alma mater on Lenox Avenue, come from Harlem. And in these minds are the dreams and the aspirations of all the young people that want to be a part of the progress that this Nation has made.

Most of them, their parents have never had an opportunity to go to college, but have been the recipients of

Pell Grants and other kinds of educational benefits. Most of their parents and grandparents have depended on Medicaid and Medicare. Most of these kids have dreams that most of your kids have today. It just seems to me that when they go home they should not be able to say that they witnessed the protection of the wealthiest people in the United States; but they should go home to say their dreams can be acquired, our Nation can be stronger, and they want to be partners in making certain that America can be all that she can be.

So as we welcome them, they are only symbolic, they are only representative of the young people of our great country, and I hope we can see clear to support them. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), who realizes that the young people would do best if we not put additional tax burdens of over \$40,000 or \$50,000 on their birth coming into this country by the actions of not living responsibly.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the RSC budget. With a deficit of \$1.6 trillion, a debt of \$14 trillion, it's no surprise that we've got to do something. We have to do something dramatic. This budget actually balances over a 9-year period, and it reforms the programs that are important to many Americans, to make them solvent and sustainable over time.

The proposals from the other side of the aisle simply don't do that. They ignore the time bomb that we have in these programs. So I commend the RSC staff and Members for putting this together. This is a good budget. We ought to support it to put our Nation on a path of financial stability and security.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the time bomb that's ticking is the time bomb on the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I can't express my concern with greater alarm about this budget. It is a budget that's going to inflict terrible harm on Americans from all walks of life, while protecting the wealthiest taxpayers in America, both individuals and Republicans.

Now, if I give the benefit of the doubt to the Republican sponsors of their budget proposal that they're sincere, they are speaking from an ideological point of view, they want to try a social experiment in this country. But if they fail to live up to what they say they're going to accomplish, there is going to be tremendous harm.

We have a social contract with seniors to provide affordable, accessible, comprehensive health care under Medicare. And they want to take Medicare and end it, and tell those people to go

to private insurance companies. We have estimates that the average senior will face cost increases of \$6,000 when the program begins, and it could be over \$11,000 per beneficiary in later years. But right away, to add insult to injury, they would reopen the doughnut hole under the part D prescription drug benefit, meaning people still have to pay all of the cost of their drugs, reversing what the Affordable Care Act provided.

But most of their cuts are coming from the Medicaid program. They want to take Medicaid and turn it into a block grant. Medicaid accounts for 43 percent of total long-term care spending in the U.S. Most of it goes to seniors and disabled people who are in nursing homes. If the States don't have enough money in their block grants, are they going to dump these people? These are human beings, and you are playing with their lives. This means real harm will be inflicted where Medicaid spending is the greatest.

By cutting reimbursement rates, Medicaid will lose providers. Nursing home quality and staffing levels will decline.

Reject this budget. Don't experiment on the most vulnerable of our population.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose the Republican Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2012. Their budget inflicts terrible harm on Americans from all walks of life—while protecting the wealthiest taxpayers in America, both individuals and corporations.

I am particularly disturbed by what the Republican budget does to Medicare and Medicaid.

There is no other way to put it: the Republican budget is the end of Medicare as we know it, and it is devastating for Medicare beneficiaries.

Medicare is a social contract with our seniors to provide affordable, accessible, comprehensive health care. The Republicans want to turn Medicare over to the private insurance industry, with payments to seniors that will fall far short of what they need to get the health care they deserve.

The Congressional Budget Office analysis of the Republican budget shows that, over the next decade, it will more than double beneficiary cost for new enrollees.

The average senior will face increased costs of over \$6,000 annually when the program begins. And all of that extra spending by seniors and people with disabilities will go to private health insurance plans.

The transfer of seniors into private plans will raise costs by over \$11,000 per beneficiary by 2030.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget reopens the donut hole under the Part D prescription drug benefit, increasing the burden on seniors starting today.

For Medicaid, the Republican budget is even worse. Medicaid covers 60 million of the country's most vulnerable people, one in 3 low income children, 5 million seniors, and 10 million disabled individuals.

It accounts for 43 percent of total long term care spending in the U.S.

But the Republican budget cuts Medicaid in half by 2022, and turns it into a block grant for the states right away.

And since the Medicaid block grant would grow by only 1 percent per year, while inflation is over 2 percent and health inflation and enrollment growth is even higher.

This means real harm will be inflicted where Medicaid spending is the greatest: on seniors and individuals with disabilities in nursing homes and those receiving benefits to live independently in their home.

By cutting reimbursement rates, Medicaid will lose health providers.

Nursing home quality and staffing levels will inevitably decline.

Medicaid cuts will mean job losses in the health professions.

The Republican budget utterly fails the basic test of humane government. It is extreme, it is mean, and it must be defeated.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who does not believe it's a social experiment to do what all families have to do: live within our means.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, folks, no prepared remarks, no fancy speeches. I brought with me a financial calculator. And regardless of how you calculate the numbers, America is spending too much money.

You know, for 3 years in a row we spent over a trillion dollars more than we were bringing in as a Nation. We are over \$14 trillion in debt. This budget puts us on a very clear path to paying back the national debt, to reducing and ending deficits in a very timely manner, to protecting the future for our children and our grandchildren, our most precious resource as Americans.

I urge my colleagues to get behind this budget, vote for it, and let's put the American spending in priority. Let's stop the spending insanity here in Washington, D.C., and let's do what we tell the folks back home we are going to do, and let's get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We can get our fiscal house in order and do this in a balanced way without ending the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, every budget is about the bottom line, and here is the Ryan budget bottom line: If you are making over a million dollars, you get a \$100,000 tax cut. If you are a senior on Medicare, you get an extra \$12,000 medical bill. If you make over a million dollars, you win the lottery. If you are a senior citizen, you lose your Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, they say this is about balancing the budget, but they are trying to balance the budget by giving tax cuts to people earning over a million dollars and taking Medicare away from our seniors. That is no way to balance the budget.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who recognizes the fact that the solutions to all the problems in the world, as the other side may think, is not raising taxes on anyone and certainly not raising the taxes on those who produce the jobs in this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget alternative.

The fact of the matter is we're broke. The Federal budget deficit is projected to exceed \$1 trillion for the next 2 fiscal years and exceed \$800 billion annually for at least the next decade. We cannot sustain this path without bankrupting our country.

Congressman RYAN's budget proposal is a great start and sets us on a path to bringing the budget into balance. However, that proposal takes 28 years to do so. I support and will vote for his budget, but I am concerned about what will happen to it if future Congresses are not as willing to make the tough choices that are necessary to see this budget path to completion. That's why I strongly support the RSC budget, which balances the Federal budget within 9 years.

Ultimately, we need a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget to force all future Congresses to make these tough decisions, but the RSC budget does the best job of getting our fiscal house in order as quickly as possible. And now I urge all Members to support it.

The RSC Budget Proposal:

Puts forward commonsense reforms to improve Medicare and Medicaid by offering increased choices and improved services, and takes steps to save Social Security.

Repeals ObamaCare to eliminate \$677 billion in additional spending over 10 years.

Freezes total discretionary spending at 2008 levels (\$933 billion) beginning in 2013.

Prevents any new tax increases, repeals the unaffordable \$813 billion tax increase included in ObamaCare, and proposes a smarter tax code that would lower rates while broadening the tax base.

Reduces unnecessary mandatory spending—other than Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—by \$1.9 trillion between 2012 and 2021.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

□ 1100

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget alternative. Today I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his courageous leadership on this issue.

You know, they say that the first step in dealing with addiction is recognize that you have got a problem. After 10 years of fighting runaway Federal

spending by both political parties here in Washington, DC, I am convinced Washington, DC is addicted to spending, and it's time that we got serious.

I am a strong supporter of the Republican budget authored by PAUL RYAN, and I am a strong supporter of the Republican Study Committee alternative offered by Mr. GARRETT.

The legislation before us today would actually put us on a pathway to achieve a balanced Federal budget by the year 2020. There are hard choices in this budget, but it's time the American people broke this addiction. It's a time that people in both political parties came together and played it straight with the American people and said there are tough choices ahead, we can do them in a way that's humane, we can do them in a way that represents fiscal discipline and reform.

But we have to act; we have to act now. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget amendment.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I also support the Ryan budget. Both these budget proposals are steps in the right direction. They make reforms that are needed. They are honest proposals. They are not trying to demagog, they are not trying to fear-monger, they are not trying to fib to the American people.

We have got to address, Mr. Chairman, the drivers of our debt. We could have no Defense Department. I could work for free; our staffs can work for free. We can get rid of 167 agencies, and we still wouldn't get rid of this debt.

Our debt is driven by these programs of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. And the reason is because reckless politicians who came before this new Member made promises that can't possibly be kept. We are here to tell the truth, Mr. Chairman.

These budgets do this job gradually, they do it humanely, and they allow people to prepare so that these programs can be saved for my kids and our grandkids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), who recognizes we must keep our promises, especially to the youth of tomorrow.

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the time this morning.

I rise today in support of the RSC budget, as well as the Ryan budget.

You know, my friends on the other side of the aisle make quick talk about the very most wealthy. Well, unfortunately, most of those file as individuals because they own LLCs and they own S corporations, as my family does. So you file those on your individual tax return. I think the American people deserve the truth regarding that number.

The second thing, I will tell you something, as a new freshman to this body, it's amazing that we want to talk about how the Republicans want to harm Medicare on the heels of a health care bill that cut \$500 billion out of Medicare. I have little patience, little patience with such talk.

I will tell you the American people deserve the truth. They need this body, rather than to propose and push forth debt, doubt and despair, they must, they require us to give them certainty, safety, and security.

I rise in support of the Ryan budget as well as RSC budget.

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

I would remind the body that the \$500 million in Medicare reform savings, which we got from ending some of the big breaks to the insurance industry, are kept in the Republican budget. You keep those savings.

What you do not do is what we did: use some of those savings to close the prescription drug doughnut hole. So you took the savings, but you left the seniors with the doughnut hole.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I strongly oppose this budget proposal. The choices the majority is making are ill considered and wrong.

Instead of working to reduce the deficit in a commonsense way, this budget ends Medicare—it ends Medicare—throws seniors to the wolves. Instead of working to control health care costs, this budget shifts them on to seniors and families.

The proposal repeals health care reform, dismantles Medicaid, throwing seniors out of nursing homes while providing giveaways to the insurance industry. It gives tax breaks to corporations that shift jobs overseas, cuts critical investments in education, research, job training and infrastructure. It provides subsidies to big oil companies, while cutting services to the most vulnerable Americans, including \$350 billion in food stamps.

Programs such as Medicaid, Pell Grants, WIC would be gutted. It cuts taxes for the wealthiest while raising taxes on the middle class. Millionaires, billionaires get a lower top tax rate and extended estate tax giveaway.

Everyone else sees deductions and credits, like the child tax credit, eliminated. This budget is Robin Hood in reverse. It takes from seniors, the middle class, working families and gives all

that money to the rich and to corporate special interests.

I urge my colleagues, stand up for the middle class today and for America's seniors and oppose this budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), who actually read this amendment and understands that it makes absolutely no changes whatsoever for seniors 60 years of age and over and actually strengthens health care for seniors in generations to come.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, by way of background, for the listeners and the people in this House, I graduated from Duke University with highest honors with distinction in economics. I say that to give you an idea, to have a little bit of insight as to what I am talking about when I talk about the two principal economic theories of our day.

One is free enterprise and the other is socialism. Let's talk about socialism for a moment. It's greater and greater government micromanaging our lives. It's higher taxes to pay for it.

Let's talk about free enterprise. Free enterprise is belief in the individual, in freedom and opportunity. It's what has helped make America one of the greatest nations this world has ever seen.

This Republican budget, the two of them—you can go with the RSC or you can go with the Ryan one—they are premised on free enterprise solutions. They will create real jobs and wealth for all Americans.

I urge this body to go with what our Founding Fathers went with, free enterprise. That's the ticket to success.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So we stand before you, as I said before, with clear distinctions on the course that this country will lead in the future. Shall we continue to make the same bad policy that we have made in the past which sets us on a fiscal crisis, which not only this side of the aisle but the President of the United States recently stated as well?

Or should we change the direction of the ship of State? Should we direct ourselves on a path towards fiscal sanity? Should we go in the direction that every single family in this country has to go in, that is to say, that we will live within our means, that we will not put an additional burden on our children and our grandchildren?

Shall we go in a direction that we can say to the seniors 60 years of age or older that we will not change your entitlements, we will not change your health care but, rather, that we will put in place today's programs that will make sure that they are here for you and for your children and future generations as well?

Shall we go on a path that says to our children of today and of tomorrow that we will not put additional burdens onto you today or in the future by putting in programs that we cannot afford?

□ 1110

The Republican Study Committee chooses the latter. The Republican Study Committee decides that we should live within our means. The Republican Study Committee ensures that our Nation spend responsibly by freezing the total discretionary spending at 2008 levels, ensures our national security by meeting Defense Secretary Gates' defense request. Our budget puts non-defense discretionary spending on a sustainable path for the future.

We reduce unnecessary mandatory spending other than Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security as opposed to what my friends on the other side of the aisle say. We strengthen Medicare's long-term finances. This budget would slowly phase in increases to Medicare eligibility and make it stronger for the future.

And most of all, unlike any other budget that will come to the floor today, this budget will actually balance, we will actually come with a balanced budget within the lifetimes of all the Members here sitting today.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the solutions outlined in our budget proposal will put our Nation on a greater, surer footing, address the fiscal crisis and set the course for dynamic innovation, job creation, and economic growth for the future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we do need to make tough choices. The question is what choices do we make? You choose to give another round of tax cuts to millionaires at the same time you're cutting investments in our kids' education. You choose not to get rid of the subsidies, taxpayer subsidies for oil companies while you end the Medicare guarantee, while you immediately eliminate the effort to close the doughnut hole, and while you cut funding for seniors in nursing homes by slashing Medicaid. Those are the choices you have made.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

Mr. GARRETT. 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 New Jersey 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 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 347, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—77

Baca	Frank (MA)	Payne
Baldwin	Fudge	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Rangel
Becerra	Gutierrez	Richardson
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Rush
Butterfield	Holt	Sánchez, Linda T.
Capuano	Honda	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
Chu	Jackson Lee	Serrano
Cicilline	(TX)	Slaughter
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Stark
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Thompson (MS)
Clay	Kucinich	Tierney
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Tonko
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Towns
Cohen	Markey	Velázquez
Conyers	McCollum	Waters
Cummings	McDermott	Watt
Davis (IL)	McGovern	Welch
Doyle	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Edwards	Moore	Woolsey
Ellison	Nadler	Wu
Farr	Napolitano	
Fattah	Pallone	
Filner	Pastor (AZ)	

NOES—347

Ackerman	Brooks	Critz
Adams	Broun (GA)	Crowley
Aderholt	Buchanan	Cuellar
Akin	Bucshon	Culberson
Alexander	Buerkle	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Amash	Burton (IN)	DeFazio
Andrews	Calvert	DeGette
Austria	Camp	DeLauro
Bachmann	Campbell	Denham
Bachus	Canseco	Dent
Barletta	Cantor	DesJarlais
Barrow	Capito	Deutch
Bartlett	Capps	Diaz-Balart
Barton (TX)	Cardoza	Dicks
Bass (NH)	Carnahan	Dingell
Benishek	Carney	Doggett
Berg	Carter	Dold
Berkley	Cassidy	Donnelly (IN)
Berman	Castor (FL)	Dreier
Biggert	Chabot	Duffy
Bilbray	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Chandler	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Coble	Ellmers
Bishop (NY)	Coffman (CO)	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Engel
Black	Conaway	Eshoo
Blackburn	Connolly (VA)	Farenthold
Bonner	Cooper	Fincher
Bono Mack	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Boren	Costello	Flake
Boswell	Courtney	Fleischmann
Boustany	Cravaack	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Flores
Braley (IA)	Crenshaw	Forbes

Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
Fox	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Franks (AZ)	Loeb	Rogers (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe	Rohrabacher
Gallely	Long	Rokita
Gardner	Lucas	Rooney
Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerlach	Lujan	Roskam
Gibbs	Lummis	Ross (AR)
Gibson	Lungren, Daniel	Ross (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	E.	Rothman (NJ)
Gohmert	Lynch	Royce
Gonzalez	Mack	Runyan
Goodlatte	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Gosar	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Gowdy	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Granger	Marino	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (GA)	Matheson	Scalise
Graves (MO)	Matsui	Schiff
Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	Schilling
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt
Griffin (AR)	McCaul	Schock
Griffith (VA)	McClintock	Schrader
Grimm	McCotter	Schwartz
Guinta	McHenry	Schweikert
Guthrie	McIntyre	Scott (SC)
Hall	McKeon	Scott (VA)
Hanabusa	McKinley	Scott, Austin
Hanna	McMorris	Scott, David
Harper	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Harris	McNerney	Sessions
Hartzler	Meehan	Sherman
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shimkus
Hayworth	Michaud	Shuler
Heck	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Heinrich	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Heller	Miller (NC)	Sires
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Smith (NE)
Herger	Moran	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Smith (WA)
Himes	Murphy (PA)	Southerland
Hinojosa	Myrick	Speier
Holden	Neal	Stearns
Hoyer	Neugebauer	Stivers
Huelskamp	Noem	Stutzman
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Sullivan
Hultgren	Nunes	Sutton
Hunter	Nunnelee	Terry
Hurt	Olson	Thompson (CA)
Inlee	Owens	Thompson (PA)
Israel	Palazzo	Thornberry
Issa	Pascarell	Tiberi
Jenkins	Paul	Tipton
Johnson (IL)	Paulsen	Tsongas
Johnson (OH)	Pearce	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Upton
Jones	Pence	Van Hollen
Jordan	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Peters	Visclosky
Kelly	Peterson	Walberg
Kildee	Petri	Walden
Kind	Pitts	Walsh (IL)
King (IA)	Platts	Walz (MN)
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Wasserman
Kingston	Polis	Schultz
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Waxman
Kissell	Posey	Webster
Kline	Price (GA)	Weiner
Labrador	Price (NC)	West
Lamborn	Quayle	Westmoreland
Lance	Quigley	Whitfield
Landry	Rahall	Wilson (SC)
Langevin	Reed	Wittman
Lankford	Rehberg	Wolf
Larsen (WA)	Renacci	Womack
Larson (CT)	Reyes	Woodall
Latham	Ribble	Yarmuth
LaTourette	Rigell	Yoder
Latta	Rivera	Young (AK)
Levin	Roby	Young (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Garamendi	Lowey	Reichert
Giffords	Meeks	Sewell
Keating	Oliver	

□ 1135

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WATT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

ON THE RETIREMENT OF THE CHAPLAIN

Mr. BOEHNER. I think all of the Members should be aware that today is Father Coughlin’s last day as our Chaplain after 11 years of service.

I think all of us, not just the Members but the officers and the staff, owe a giant debt of gratitude to Father Dan. He has been an invaluable part of our community, not just with the opening prayer but his counsel and his guidance that he’s offered to all of us. In the House’s darkest hours, he’s been there to gently lead us back to safe haven. In between, when things get really noisy around here, he tries to encourage us to stop, find some quiet time, and reflect.

He was appointed by Speaker Hastert 11 years ago. He comes from Chicago, where he will return. I am sure that there’s one person that’s real happy he’s returning, and that’s his mother, who’s 96 years young.

So, Father Dan, on behalf of the whole House, I want to thank you for your service. I know we haven’t always been the most cooperative congregation. I hope that you will keep this House and the people who serve here in your prayers. We will keep you in ours.

With that, I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As is very evident by the response to your remarks in praise of Father Coughlin, if there’s one thing that Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives agree on, it is that God has truly blessed us with the service of Father Coughlin as our Chaplain for the past 11 years.

When we talk about him being our Chaplain, it’s not that he’s just the Chaplain of the Members, he’s the Chaplain for the staff, for the carpenter that we see in the hall, for the service employees who are here. He ministers to the needs of all of us here, sometimes in a very macro way.

□ 1140

When 9/11 struck, or in Tucson most recently, or with the anthrax threat, those kinds of things had an impact on all of us. Father was there for us as a group, and he was there for us individually. We never know what joys or pain our colleagues or our workers here are undergoing or suffering. Father Dan knows more than most of us, and his discretion is something that we all value and respect.

Father Dan has ministered to the needs of the poor with the Missionaries of Charity in Calcutta, India. He has meditated with the Trappist monks in the monastery, and I think he’s going back to do some of that again. He has been a scholar-in-residence at the North American College in Rome, exchanging ideas there. He has ministered to the needs of his parishioners in LaGrange, Illinois, and that probably serves him best for ministering to

the diverse needs of the flock that he shepherds here. We are very, very, very honored.

Last year, many of us in a bipartisan way stood up and sang the praises. It seems so recent, but it was a year ago. Then after that, Father was honored in Illinois for serving as a priest for 50 years. For some of us, it was really a special source of pride. Although we respect all of our Chaplains, it was a source of personal pride that he was the first Roman Catholic Chaplain in the House of Representatives, and he showed that he could minister to the needs of all of the Members of all faiths here.

So, yes, we are very blessed by his service in the Congress. We are going to miss him a great deal. We wish him well as he goes forth. The legacy that he left us is one that was not only of opening prayer each day to inspire us and lift us to a higher place in our deliberations, but he set an example of civility in the Congress of confidentiality of relationships. He was a great Chaplain. We will miss him greatly, and we are enormously grateful to him.

Thank you, Father Coughlin.

Mr. BOEHNER. Father Dan, may God be with you.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 136, answered “present” 172, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—119

Akin	Coble	Graves (GA)
Amash	Coffman (CO)	Griffith (VA)
Austria	Cole	Guinta
Bachmann	Conaway	Hall
Bachus	Culberson	Harper
Bartlett	Denham	Harris
Barton (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Blackburn	Flake	Herger
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Brooks	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Flores	Hunter
Buerkle	Foxx	Issa
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Garrett	Jordan
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Kelly
Carter	Goodlatte	King (IA)
Cassidy	Gosar	Kingston
Chabot	Gowdy	Kline
Chaffetz	Granger	Labrador

Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer

NOES—136

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Billirakis
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Gerlach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—172

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn

Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pence
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schmidt

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNealey
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pasarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
Less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1158

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. DREIER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GALLEGLY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Messrs. ELLISON, TIERNEY, GUTIERREZ, DINGELL, SARBANES, BECERRA, RICHMOND, GRIJALVA, DEFAZIO, FRANK of Massachusetts, GEORGE MILLER of California, MCDERMOTT, PAYNE, HONDA, LYNCH, MCNERNEY, WAXMAN, CLYBURN, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, PASCRELL, MICHAUD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Messrs. LIPINSKI and RUSH changed their vote from "no" to "present."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 112-62.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to put in order the Democratic substitute budget.

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 2012.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—
Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Transitional Medical Assistance.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance.
Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability.
Sec. 210. Reserve fund for additional tax relief for individuals and families.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 303. Costs of overseas contingency operations and emergency needs.
Sec. 304. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY

Sec. 401. Policy of the House on Social Security reform that protects workers and retirees.
Sec. 402. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
Sec. 403. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 404. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
Sec. 405. Policy of the House on health care for military servicemembers and their families and veterans.
Sec. 406. Policy of the House on overseas contingency operations.
Sec. 407. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 408. Policy of the House on tax reform and deficit reduction.
Sec. 409. Policy of the House on agriculture spending.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$1,874,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,160,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,427,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,617,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$2,766,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,912,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,088,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,440,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,621,001,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: –\$16,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –\$194,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: –\$242,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: –\$213,460,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: –\$204,735,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: –\$262,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: –\$245,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: –\$237,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: –\$240,015,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: –\$262,582,000,000.

(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 2012: \$3,019,682,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$3,020,663,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,211,158,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,343,359,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,558,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,724,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,883,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$4,098,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,314,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,497,789,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$3,056,448,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$3,077,023,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,199,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,342,246,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,549,501,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,691,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,828,322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$4,056,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,258,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,452,330,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$1,181,627,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$916,327,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$771,492,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$724,804,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$783,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$778,175,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$739,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$791,201,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$818,457,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$831,329,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$16,316,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$17,417,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$18,385,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$19,336,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$20,362,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$21,403,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$22,433,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$23,505,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$24,622,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$25,784,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: \$11,533,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,463,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$13,241,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,972,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$14,753,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$15,533,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$16,282,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$17,087,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$17,936,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$18,810,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$585,002,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,671,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$602,362,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,636,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$606,563,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$631,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$618,331,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$644,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$633,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$656,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$642,314,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$668,081,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$680,295,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$667,865,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$692,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$679,939,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$705,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$692,242,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,982,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,638,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,105,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,002,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,018,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,049,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,083,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,820,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,348,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,511,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,299,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,566,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,940,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,783,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,380,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,049,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,711,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,970,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,471,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,819,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,079,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,875,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,240,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,682,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,280,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,262,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,723,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,267,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,827,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,667,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,923,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,686,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,857,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,974,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,368,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,740,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,587,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,448,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,031,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,456,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,583,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,599,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,772,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,066,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,309,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,419,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,260,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,942,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,863,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,980,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,889,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,795,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,052,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,889,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$3,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$4,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$7,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$6,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$7,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,194,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$93,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$93,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$94,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$95,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$96,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$96,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$98,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$99,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$100,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$99,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$100,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$104,951,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,802,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$111,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$117,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$106,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$111,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$110,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$118,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$115,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$122,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$120,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$124,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$123,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$126,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$125,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$128,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$126,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$130,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$128,515,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$356,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$358,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$368,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$452,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$435,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$518,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$506,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$565,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$570,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$612,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$615,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$654,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$700,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$697,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$755,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$742,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$799,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$795,946,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$483,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$483,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$520,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$521,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$548,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$548,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$571,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$571,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$618,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$618,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$640,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$640,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$663,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$662,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$722,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$723,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$775,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$774,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$829,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$828,970,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$536,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$531,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$523,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$522,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$520,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$519,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$518,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$516,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$525,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$527,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$526,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$523,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$530,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$523,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$546,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$543,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$557,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$554,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$570,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$567,314,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$54,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$54,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$53,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,053,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$128,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$128,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$130,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$130,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$134,143,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$134,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$138,167,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$137,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$146,868,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,323,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$145,704,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$145,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$144,751,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$154,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$158,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,622,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,182,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,072,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,008,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,239,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,230,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,823,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,808,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,848,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,743,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,427,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,045,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,430,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,682,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,039,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,419,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,492,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,927,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,930,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,510,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,173,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,198,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,502,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,191,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,275,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,735,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,841,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,377,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,511,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,931,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$373,659,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,659,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$439,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,991,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$519,615,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$519,615,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,459,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$678,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$678,904,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$756,129,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$756,129,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$827,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$827,473,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$890,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$890,592,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$953,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$953,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,006,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,006,915,000,000.
 (19) Non-Security Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$20,374,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$13,539,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$16,513,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$10,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$22,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$22,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,208,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,209,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$28,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,537,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$30,325,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$29,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$33,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$32,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$35,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$34,708,000,000.
 (20) Security Allowances (930)
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$8,592,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$20,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,405,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,052,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$30,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$35,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,385,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$35,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$33,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$36,409,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$35,217,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$37,142,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,167,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$37,884,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$38,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$37,728,000,000.
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$77,923,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$77,923,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$80,329,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$80,329,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$81,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$81,798,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$84,857,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$84,857,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$85,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$85,946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$91,248,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$91,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$97,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$97,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$101,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,718,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$105,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$105,645,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$110,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$110,174,000,000.
 (22) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$126,544,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$118,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,077,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,497,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,201,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$515,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for a robust Federal investment in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities that creates jobs for Americans and boosts the economy. The revisions may include measures that:

- (1) Provide for additional investments to improve energy efficiency, develop renewable energy sources, and provide the training for workers in these industries ("clean energy

jobs”) by the amounts in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(2) Reauthorize Federal highway and transit programs by providing new contract authority by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure establishes or maintains a solvent Highway Trust Fund over the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017. “Solvency” is defined as a positive cash balance. Such measure may include a transfer into the Highway Trust Fund from other Federal funds, as long as the transfer of Federal funds is fully offset.

(3) Create a National Infrastructure Bank to pool Federal, State, local, tribal, and private-sector resources for a wide range of investments of national or regional significance by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(4) Provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors, seaports, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(5) Provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to small businesses, non-profits, States, and communities to expand investment and to train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

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

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

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

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

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

(5) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (“clean energy jobs”);

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

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

(1) enhances health care for military personnel, military retirees, or veterans;

(2) maintains the affordability of health care for military personnel, military retirees, or veterans;

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016, or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program in title XIX of the Social Security Act through fiscal year 2012, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

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

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to

ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. When 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends Trade Adjustment Assistance and the 2009 reforms to Trade Adjustment Assistance, which expired earlier this year, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable, including efforts to maintain the maximum Pell grant award, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 210. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(1) for fiscal year 2013 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2014, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

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

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012.

SEC. 302. 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, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 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 \$623,000,000, and that amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates \$7,233,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$1,257,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates up to \$581,000,000, 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 House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates \$10,000,000 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 \$60,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution,

amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 for overseas contingency operations and other activities and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(22) for fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 and the new outlays resulting therefrom.

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

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

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

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

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall not apply to measures for which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has made an adjustment contemplated under title II of this resolution.

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

to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in 2010, 53 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of about \$14,000, while the average total retirement income is only about \$25,000 per year;

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

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

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

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

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in 2010, more than 40 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) excess health care cost growth is not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, it is endemic to the entire health care system;

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks; and

(6) shifting excess health care cost growth onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce

overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both.

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

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

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

(2) the Affordable Care Act signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to more than 30,000,000 Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefiting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

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

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

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

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million seniors, and 10 million disabled individuals who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

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

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and disabled individuals facing significant costs for long-term care; and

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

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for senior citizens, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant that is incapable of responding

to increased need that may result from trends in health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON HEALTH CARE FOR MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES AND VETERANS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that active duty military servicemembers and their families value the high-quality health care they receive through Tricare and other programs run by the Defense Department, and veterans rely on the health service network run by the Department of Veterans Affairs to address their unique health needs.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the Congress should reject legislation that would damage the excellent care provided to the men and women who are serving and who have served the country in uniform; and that any future health care legislation that eliminates quality Federal health care programs for military servicemembers and veterans and replaces them with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) it is the stated position of the Administration that all troops will be redeployed from Iraq by the end of 2011; and

(2) it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

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

(1) consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014; and

(2) any future operations should be funded through the base budget.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the country's national security depends upon a well-coordinated strategy that involves the Department of Defense, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security, and international affairs programs—including those at the Department of State and the Agency for International Development;

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

(3) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

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

(5) the House Budget Committee voted and passed on a bipartisan vote of 33-5 an amendment to the 2012 budget resolution recognizing that national security programs should be considered as part of a serious deficit reduction plan;

(6) the national security recommendations of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform contained a number of suggestions for savings that could be made without jeopardizing our troops, military families, veterans, or the country's security and global standing;

(7) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies,

including the Department of Defense—an agency that has been unable to pass a clean audit—and the Department of Homeland Security, such as the elimination of programs the Government Accountability Office recently reported as duplicative, which could save billions of dollars;

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

(9) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats;

(10) the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and other U.S. international affairs agencies can save money and improve cost-effectiveness by ensuring that their workforces have the appropriate mix of direct-hire personnel and contractors, as identified by the Administration's 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review;

(11) the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security should perform a comprehensive review of the role that contractors play in their operations, including the degree to which contractors are performing inherently governmental functions, to ensure they have the most effective mix of government and contracted personnel;

(12) ballistic missile defense technologies that are not proven to work through adequate testing and that are not operationally viable should not be deployed, and that no funding should be provided for the research or development of space-based interceptors;

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

(14) the Department of Defense should make every effort to investigate the national security benefits of energy independence, including those that may be associated with alternative energy sources and energy efficiency conversions.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that after thorough review, the Committee on Appropriations shall determine savings within the Nation's security programs as identified in subsection (a)(1) below the levels in the President's 2012 budget equal to the amounts in section 102(20).

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the House must pursue deficit reduction through reform of the tax code, which contains numerous tax breaks for special interests;

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

(3) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(4) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas;

(5) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is

badly in need of reform and proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This resolution's revenue policies achieve the same net savings as the revenue policies in the President's budget. It does not endorse any of the President's specific proposals unless expressly stated in this resolution.

(2) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution extend the middle class tax cuts, provide long-term relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for tens of millions of middle class American families, and provide estate tax relief at the 2009 levels.

(B) The President and this resolution apply President Clinton's top two tax rates to persons with adjusted gross incomes above \$200,000 (\$250,000 for married couples). The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform plan also assumes revenue from returning to those top two tax rates for top earners.

(C) The President and this resolution extend policies that support saving and capital formation.

(D) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the various proposals made by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures and raise revenue for deficit reduction; and expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-income taxpayers. This resolution protects middle-income taxpayers and encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider tax expenditure reform proposals that would apply to households with over \$1 million in adjusted gross income, consistent with the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform's proposals to limit tax expenditures.

(3) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution assume elimination of subsidies for the major integrated oil and gas companies, and pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs—rather than products—overseas.

(B) This resolution adopts those and other pro-growth corporate tax incentives in the President's budget, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the full range of different corporate tax reform proposals to determine which one can most effectively optimize economic growth and provide for necessary revenues.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the current looming Federal deficit threatens our Nation's economic security and continued growth;

(2) the Committee on Agriculture reduced spending in programs under its jurisdiction when writing the 2008 farm bill;

(3) as directed by the 2008 Farm Bill, the Department of Agriculture realized an additional \$6 billion in crop insurance savings by renegotiating the Standard Reinsurance Agreement;

(4) soaring crop prices and a booming farm sector make agriculture subsidies—particularly those originally designed to be temporary—difficult to defend in a time of fiscal constraint; and

(5) farm policy is vital to rural communities and protects food and energy security around the country.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that the Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The Committee should also find ways to focus assistance away from wealthy agribusinesses and toward struggling family farmers in a manner that protects jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our top priority in this Congress should be to support a robust economic recovery and put America back to work. That is what the Democratic plan does. It reduces the deficit in a steady, predictable way without slashing important investments in our kids' education and strategic national investments, without ending the Medicare guarantee, and without putting seniors, disabled individuals and kids at risk who rely on Medicare, and it reduces the deficit in a balanced way by \$1.2 trillion more than the President's budget and achieves primary balance in the year 2018.

The Republican plan we've been discussing is a narrow vision of America—a place with no shared sacrifice, a place where those who have benefited the most from what our country has to offer give little in return.

The Democrats have a different vision for our country. We believe our strength springs not only from the undisputed benefits of a free people pursuing their ambitions and their dreams but also from sometimes harnessing those talents for important national purposes.

We believe America's greatness is rooted not only in a collection of individuals acting alone but from our capacity to work together for the common good. We believe that is a patriotic vision of America. We do not see the government as an enemy but as the imperfect instrument by which we can accomplish together as a people what no individual or single corporation can do alone.

Small business owners recognize that they must make certain investments to build a successful enterprise. Similarly, our Nation must make the strategic national investments necessary to keep our country strong in an increasingly global economic marketplace. Our plan does that.

We also believe we can do that while making cuts, and we make sensible, targeted cuts. But we do it in a smart way, not with a meat ax that threatens the fragile recovery.

We also agree with the fiscal commission that security spending should be part of this debate. Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated, and I quote, that the most significant threat to our national

security is our national debt. There is growing bipartisan consensus that those security agencies must themselves be part of our effort to reduce our debt and strengthen our country.

Our approach is a balanced one. We take cuts in the discretionary and bring down that part of the budget to the lowest point as a percentage of the economy since the Eisenhower administration. We take cuts in other areas. We take cuts in mandatory programs, including agriculture subsidies.

But we make different choices than the Republican budget. We end the subsidies to Big Oil rather than keeping those as we cut education for our kids. We ask the folks at the very top to pay the same tax rate they paid during the Clinton administration rather than end the Medicare guarantee and slash funding for seniors in nursing homes and others who rely on that support.

We make very different choices in this budget, but we accomplish the goal in a fiscally responsible way.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I want to start off by commending Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It's not always that the minority offers an alternative budget. In fact, I know there are a lot of pressures not to do that. So I think Mr. VAN HOLLEN is to be commended, and his very capable staff, for actually proposing an alternative. That's important. It's important that we bring ideas to the table so we can have a real debate about ideas. I want to start with saying that.

Number two, we just have a different definition of "fiscal responsibility," I suppose. This budget, relative to the mark, to the base budget we're talking about, increases spending by \$4.5 trillion, raises taxes by \$2 trillion, and it adds \$2.4 trillion to the deficit compared to the base bill we're talking about here.

It does exceed the President's budget in debt reduction, in deficit reduction, and so the gentleman is to be commended for that, but I personally think the President's budget is a pretty low water mark. It exceeds it by raising taxes another \$210 billion and also cutting defense by \$614 billion above the cuts that are in the base, our budget, and in the President's budget.

Secretary Gates has warned us that such cuts would leave the military unable to meet its current missions. And using his words: "Setting indiscriminate targets to scrimp on defense is math, not strategy."

I think it's very important that we recognize our priorities. Number one, national defense is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. When our war fighters tell us this doesn't allow them to have the tools to keep them safe, the equipment they

need to prosecute their jobs, I think that's not responsible.

When our economy is struggling to get out of a very deep recession, over \$2 trillion in tax increases I just don't think is responsible.

□ 1210

On the alternative, I think what we are offering is responsible. Our budget does four basic things. It gets the economy growing. It keeps taxes where they are and prevents massive tax increases. It saves our Medicare and Medicaid programs. It fulfills the mission of health and retirement security for all Americans by guaranteeing that people who have retired and are about to retire keep what they have, what they have organized their lives around, and then reforms these programs so that they're solvent and sustainable for the next generation. Number three, it repairs our social safety net so that it works. And it, number four, pays off our debt. That's what we do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal commission said of the Republican plan it was an unbalanced approach. Our approach is a balanced approach. Secretary Gates' comments were directed to the fiscal commission's recommendations. Our proposals are in line with what the President outlined just the other day. I would point out that Governor Haley Barbour said, "If we Republicans don't propose some savings of money on defense, we will have no credibility on anything else." Of course the Pentagon has never passed a GAO budget, and I think everybody who does budgets recognizes there is some savings to be found there.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from our Republican friends that they're transforming Medicare. They call it a move to premium support. They also say they're just fixing the flaws in Medicaid. They say they're being brave, and finally tackling entitlement reform. But earlier today, on one of the morning shows, I heard my friend from Texas, JEB HENSARLING, being finally candid about the Republicans' view of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. He called them cruel Ponzi schemes. So there we have it.

This isn't about being brave, or transformative, or making a few changes to save the economy. Republicans are pushing the same agenda they have always had, ending the safety net programs that they view as fraudulent. And the Republican budget does exactly that. It ends Medicare, results in a huge cost shift, and forces seniors to pay \$6,000 per year out of pocket.

It block grants Medicaid, slashes nursing home aid, and would lead to 50

different benefit programs across the country. That takes us back to my childhood, when benefits in our country were determined by what State you may have been fortunate or unfortunate to have been born in.

But the greatest fraud being committed is that these drastic and unfair changes don't even bring the Republican budget to balance. In fact, the Republican budget adds \$8 trillion to the deficit over the next decade. Then where is all that money going, one might ask. While Republicans are gutting Medicare and Medicaid with one hand, they're giving tax breaks to big oil companies and making tax cuts for the wealthy with the other hand. That's what I call a Ponzi scheme.

Now, if you're wealthy or a special interest group, this is surely a pathway to prosperity. But if you're in your golden years, it's the Road to Ruin. Democrats have a plan to reduce the deficit in a steady, responsible way as we build a foundation for shared prosperity and long-term economic growth. In fact, the Democratic budget achieves primary balance by fiscal year 2018, and cuts the deficit by \$1.2 trillion more than the President's budget. I proudly support the Democratic alternative budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

We have heard from the minority party that their budget seeks to harness the American people. Why? They have already saddled the American people with record spending deficits and debt. Just say "neigh."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words about Medicare if I can. First and foremost, I want to make it very clear that if you are 55 and over, there are no changes to you whatsoever. We hear a lot about Medicare as we know it. Unfortunately, Medicare as we know it is going bankrupt. If you are for the status quo with regard to Medicare, you're on the side of the elimination of Medicare as we know it.

Another point I want to make is, we hear a lot about cuts. These are Washington cuts. This is Washington cut-speak. Where I'm from, if you get \$5 on a Monday and the next day you get \$10, that's an increase, not a cut. Most Americans would be appalled to know, Mr. Chairman, that the increases we are seeing are being called cuts. And I'm going to explain it to my folks when I get back to Arkansas. Medicare has not one penny of cuts in this budget. It continues to grow.

With regard to the language about vouchers, there is no voucher here. We're trying to give the folks that are 55 and under health care like Members of Congress have. Have you ever, Mr. Chairman, heard anyone in Congress

describe their own health care plan as a voucher? No. Of course you haven't. Because it's not. That word has been rolled out with the other tested words, "privatization," all this other nonsense, for the purposes of politics. You don't want the American people, Mr. Chairman, to have the same health care that you have.

I support this budget because it will keep our promise to seniors, it will save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and it will preserve this country for my kids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge Republican Members to read their own budget. It does not give seniors the same deal as Members of Congress. Members of Congress have a fair share formula. Seniors do not under their bill. Seniors get an immediate cut to the prescription drug benefit to the extent that we closed the doughnut hole, and they don't. Let's get our facts straight.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I want to thank Chairman VAN HOLLEN and I want to thank Mr. RYAN for the conduct of this debate that's taking place. They are two exemplary examples of how debate and discussion should move forward and emanate here in the House of Representatives.

Harry Truman said, "Every segment of our population, and every individual, has a right to expect from his government a fair deal." I rise in strong support of the fair deal that's being proposed by the Democratic side in this debate. I rise because it helps us out with jobs and the economy, and recognizes that we must deal with the deficit, but deal with it in a manner that makes sense.

In my hometown we go to a place called Augie & Ray's. In Augie & Ray's, they want to know, whose side are you on in this? When you take Medicare and end the program as we know it, and shift the burden of the deficit at a time when we need shared sacrifice to the elderly, it is just flatly unfair. The social contract that the governed, that the people have with their government is about shared sacrifice, but it's also about the guarantee.

□ 1220

This is not about charts and statistics and flow charts; it's about people at the end of the day who are impacted by the decisions that we make; not by some economist's theory, but about a guarantee from their government, a guarantee that if they pay in, at the end of the day they are going to receive the benefits they have worked so hard for all of their lives.

That guarantee shouldn't be two-tiered. That guarantee shouldn't cut off benefits immediately to some and postpone it for others. That's a guarantee we should be working to fix, not to end. That is the fundamental difference in what's going on here today.

My distinguished colleague, the leader, Mr. CLYBURN, said let's recognize what's going on here, the extreme differences that have existed in this party since Roosevelt became President. An end of Social Security, an end of Medicare, an end to Medicaid, that has been the goal of the other side.

I stand in strong support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My colleague from Connecticut talked about a guarantee. Well, there is one guarantee that is for sure, Mr. Chairman, and that is the guarantee that Medicare as we know it is a pipe dream into perpetuity. It's going broke. The guarantee that the Democratic House has brought us in the past is a guarantee that says 47 percent of our debt obligations are to foreigners.

We are guaranteed right now to borrow 40 cents on every dollar unless we do something about it. So what do we do about it? There are famous themes in literature that fast-forward into the future. You get a glimpse of the reality of the future, and then we always love it when the hero comes back and says, Oh, here's what's going on. There's a choice. Let's make a good choice and let's move forward.

Well, we don't need fiction today. What we need is the clear-eyed reality of what these numbers present to us, and they present to us a choice:

We can either choose to do nothing, and I would say that is choosing, or we can choose to do something. We can choose to do a historic plan that brings a brightness to the economy, that creates jobs and opportunity, that doesn't mortgage our children's future to China and ultimately puts the U.S. on a global competitive basis, the likes of which the world will have never seen.

This is a time of choosing. Let's move forward and choose the House Republican plan, which makes guarantees and makes promises that we can keep with.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a time of choosing. Our budget chooses to make investments in our kids rather than choosing to provide even bigger tax breaks to the very wealthy, and we choose to get rid of subsidies for oil companies instead of cutting nursing homes funding through Medicare for seniors and disabled individuals.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget cuts the President's 2012 request for international affairs by \$20 billion. That's 39 percent of the amount in diplomacy and development outside of Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. While diplomacy and development account for only about 1 percent

of the overall budget, under the Republican plan this tiny portion of the budget would absorb a wildly disproportionate share of the cuts.

Here's what it means on the ground: Taking AIDS patients off lifesaving medication, withholding bed nets from children in malaria zones, and standing idly by during humanitarian emergencies.

I know the chairman of the committee, I know he doesn't want to see those things happen, but the effect of his plan would make them happen.

The Democratic alternative takes a wise and responsible approach to reducing the deficit. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about Medicare for a moment. It's not as if we don't have a problem. We know Medicare is going broke in 9 years. We want to make sure that the people who have retired and who are 10 years away from retiring can bank on the promises that have been made for them.

But to keep that promise, we have to reform it and save it for the next generation. So that's why we have a plan that says for people 54 and below, you too will have a plan of guaranteed Medicare coverage from guaranteed Medicare plans that you get to choose from. Choice and competition works.

A prescription drug benefit, a bunch of plans that compete against each other for the seniors' business, came in 41 percent below cost projections. Why? Because it's not a government-run program. It's not a bunch of bureaucrats.

What is the President proposing? What are the Democrats proposing? Here's what they have proposed for current seniors. The President just gave us a glimpse of it 2 days ago. He wants to take this board of 15 people he appoints on this rationing board, and they make the decisions. They price-control Medicare. They ration Medicare, \$480 billion, almost \$10,000 per senior on current seniors.

We are saying, don't do this to seniors, get rid of the rationing board and don't delegate Medicare decision-making to 15 people appointed by the President with no congressional oversight. Let the 40 million seniors in Medicare be in charge of their Medicare program. More importantly, we save Medicare, prevent its bankruptcy.

What does the other side do? They sit by and watch the program go bankrupt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that the reason Medicare was created in the first place was because the private insurance industry wouldn't cover seniors' affordable care. That's what they want to go back to.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic resolution.

Last week on the floor of the House, the Republican leader, ERIC CANTOR,

asked a very important question. He asked, How did we get here? So I took the challenge. I went back and have carefully chronicled a series of vote steps and quotes from Newt Gingrich, Dick Arme, John Kasich and others who argued against the Clinton plan for balancing the budget.

Remember when Clinton left office, the clock in Times Square had been turned off. Alan Greenspan said, you're paying down the debt too quickly.

We've had five balanced budgets since 1969; four of them came with Bill Clinton. The prescription that was offered on January 20 of the Bush inauguration was massive tax cuts and the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan.

And our Republican friends ask, How did we get here?

I am very optimistic about engaging in this conversation now and as we get to the debt ceiling. When Clinton walked out on January 19, 2001, 22 million jobs had been created. Economic growth averaged 4 percent per quarter. It was the greatest period of economic prosperity in the history of America. And our friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn the clock back on that reality.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I do appreciate the conversation about the balanced budgets in the past.

Yes, Bill Clinton was the President there. He did sign that budget. But as this House knows, above any other place, this House is very aware that budgets originate in the House of Representatives. So Republicans were leading the House of Representatives pulling that budget together.

We are proposing a similar thing again, that a Republican House can propose a budget, send it to a Democrat President, and we work together to start balancing the budget again.

So that formula that we just discussed, I believe, is a very good formula. We should initiate that again and say, once again, a Republican House, do a great budget, send it over to a Democrat President, and be able to work their way through it.

I would disagree with the cuts in defense. I think it is a very common statement that we can look and say there are issues with defense systems. There are issues with our acquisition process in defense.

□ 1230

Where I would disagree is we should then take our defense and where we find savings, then move it over to deficit reductions. I represent an area around Tinker Air Force Base in Midwest City. It is a great base that is strategic to us. Those planes that fly out of there are 50-plus years old. There are some airmen that are flying with the same tail number that their grandfather flew 50 years ago. This is a

moment when we should not be robbing from defense and saying we are going to use that for deficit reduction that we need to be reinvesting.

Robert Gates, our Secretary of Defense, has said there's \$178 billion that he can find, and \$78 billion of that savings is applied to deficit reduction in the Republican plan, and \$100 billion of it is reinvested back into the Defense Department. There are good ways to do this that leave America safe and that make strategic sense. We think we should do those things.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start by thanking my own chairman, Mr. RYAN, and also the ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for the entire process. It has been my first year. I have enjoyed it. We've had some spirited debates. I know that we have disagreed more than we agree, but I have appreciated the opportunity to do this.

I'll close with this. This will be the last opportunity I'll have to speak on this year's budget. We've heard a lot about the benefits that accrued to this Nation during the Clinton administration. I for one am willing to give partial credit to the President at that time. It was a Democrat President. Yes, it was. It was a House of Representatives controlled by my party. And I think it was a formula that worked for the Nation.

We've heard a lot of things, though, about the importance of raising the tax rates back to the Clinton era in order to solve our problems. I would suggest to you it was not the tax rates during the Clinton era that drove our prosperity at the time.

Let me show you what President Clinton did to the size of the government workforce. President Clinton was elected right about here. There was a dramatic reduction in the size of the Federal workforce, a dramatic reduction in the size of Federal spending on people who work for the Federal Government. In fact, unprecedented in the last 30 years, done again under a Democrat President and a Republican House.

What happened as a result? As spending as a percentage of our economy went down, the unemployment rate went down. As the government spent less, more people went back to work. As we sit here, we all agree that the discussion is really about jobs. There's nothing more telling than what happened during the Clinton administration as a formula for how to create jobs—the government needs to spend less.

My question to my esteemed colleagues on this side of the aisle is, where is this type of leadership out of the White House these days? Where is this generation's Bill Clinton saying let's spend less on government spending so that people go back to work? If we put President Obama's proposals, his current budget, up here, it would be almost the exact opposite of what your party proposed only 20 years ago. Where is that type of leadership out of the White House?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Democrat substitute amendment. Let me just quickly here sum up. The Democrats' prescription, if you will, for our Nation's fiscal troubles basically includes what? More spending, more debt and more taxes, more taxes on hardworking families and small businesses. And so while the Democrat budget has lower deficits than, well, the President's budget, you really need to take a closer look at how they achieve this and how they achieve the deficit reduction compared to the White House's budget.

Let's take a look at it. First, well, they raise taxes again. How much? By \$208 billion more than the President's budget on all Americans. Then what do they do next? They cut the defense budget. By how much? By \$614 billion again relative to the President's budget over the 10-year window. Now, at the same time, you already had Secretary Gates who has said that we need to cut the Defense budget by \$78 billion. They want to cut Defense by \$614 billion on top of that.

What about in addition to that? Well, in their budget, if you go into it and look, there's about \$400 billion in unspecified savings. Unspecified? Here at the 12th hour they still can't decide how they want to try to rein in spending? Of course not, because they really honestly don't want to do so.

I believe that budgets must be credible, and the Democrats' budget doesn't pass that test at all. The only specific savings in the budget come from how? Raising taxes again on Americans and cutting the defense budget. The Democrat budget does not tackle even the drivers behind our deficits. What are they? It does not address the pending bankruptcy—yes, bankruptcy—of Medicare and Medicaid. The Democrat budget is nothing more than punting, which is exactly what the administration and the White House have been doing as well.

Now, look, the American people want Congress to do the right thing. The American people want us to get spending, want us to get deficits, and they want us to get our debt here in Washington under control, just as American families have to get their spending, deficit and debt under control, just as

small businesses across this country have to get it under control. The Democrats' budget is frankly an embarrassment and shows that the other side is not serious about taking our fiscal challenges seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 45 seconds.

What we heard just doesn't fit the facts. In fact, our budget does make cuts to domestic programs, but we do not do it in a meat ax way. We make cuts to agriculture subsidies. We do tax reform as the commission recommended, getting rid of a lot of clutter in the Tax Code for special interests. That is what we do.

With respect to defense, our numbers track what the President was saying the other day, but we do get rid of a so-called overseas contingency fund which we think our Republican friends would like to join us on which gives the executive branch a blank check to undertake any military operations whatsoever for the next 10 years and doesn't have to ask Congress. That's what we do.

What we don't do? We don't end the Medicare guarantee. What we don't do is we don't keep giving subsidies to oil companies while we cut education for kids. That's what we don't do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him and the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work to bring legislation to the floor to enable us to have this debate yesterday and today and I think for a long time to come.

We have said it over and over again: A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. It should reflect what is important to us as we allocate the resources of investments for the future. Much has been said about this deficit, and I want to join the distinguished ranking member before I go any further in correcting the record.

I listened with great interest as Members on the other side are taking credit for the Clinton administration balanced, or budgets in surplus. And I remind them or tell them, because many of them may not know, that those budgets were a result of the 1993 budget vote that we took on this floor of the House without one Republican vote which was the source of that fiscal discipline and job creation, again, as other speakers have said, over 20 million jobs created.

So when I hear the Republicans say it was the Clinton Presidency and the Republican Congress, no, it was the Democratic Congress, because we know that deficit reduction is essential. We had to stop the budget deficits that President Clinton inherited, and now

we have to stop the budget deficits that President Obama inherited.

Budget deficits, I've heard our colleagues say, are immoral. I quite agree. We have a responsibility and an obligation to our children and our grandchildren not to send them any bills, personal or official. And we do not intend to do so. But they were immoral during the Bush years, too, when they were giving tax cuts to the rich, two unpaid-for wars and a prescription drug benefit that gave away the store to the private sector and sent the bill to the taxpayer.

So here we are with a choice on the floor. Some of it was spoken; a vision of it was shared with the Nation by President Obama the other day. He talked about an America of greatness that cared about its people. He talked about the essential need for us to reduce the deficit. He talked about growth, investments, and job creation.

□ 1240

He talked about being fair to our seniors and keeping our promise to them. In the budgets that we have before us today, one presented by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, one presented by the Republicans, we see a sharp contrast, one that supports the vision that the President puts forth, and one that definitely does not.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the budget deficit; but we also in doing so, if we are going to do right by the American people, have to recognize that there are other deficits. We have a deficit in education. We have a deficit in innovation because innovation begins in the classroom. We have a deficit in investments in our infrastructure. All of these investments have a payoff back to us. They create growth. They bring revenue to the Treasury, and they help reduce the deficit.

It is a false economy to think that we can write a budget that cuts serious investments in education, infrastructure, innovation and the rest and think that we are going to end the deficit. You cannot cut your way out of it. You cut, you grow, and you increase revenue. That's a subject I will hold for when we talk about the Republican budget more specifically.

What is important to note, if you had one thing to know about the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans in terms of these budgets, if you had just one thing, it would be on the subject of Medicare. The Republican budget breaks the promise that this country has made to seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement. But the plan here ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces seniors to buy their insurance from the health insurance companies where the average senior would be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit—as much for some as \$20,000 a year.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart, "Senior Citi-

zens Health Cost Skyrockets Under Republican Budget." Blue is the government share, red is the beneficiary share. Health care spending for a typical 65-year-old in 2022 dollars, the Republican budget would have \$8,000 from the Federal Government, \$12,500 from the individual, which is more than twice what the Medicare cost should be to a senior, \$6,150; twice as much for less in benefit.

Now, this chart is not our chart. This information was conveyed to the Republican chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, in a letter to him describing what the cost would be to seniors under his plan. I just don't think that is fair to our seniors. This plan has the wrong priorities. It is focused on helping corporate special interests and Wall Street, not reducing the deficit or helping the country.

It raises taxes for the middle class while cutting them for the wealthiest in our country. It repeals Wall Street reforms for the big banks. It abolishes Medicare as we know it, cuts funding for education, health care, alternative energy and job training programs, and uses the money not for reducing the deficit but to help the most privileged, help the most privileged and negate what we did in our health care bill, which was to start to close the doughnut hole.

If you are a senior and you see that your prescription drug costs will come down under the health care bill and the doughnut hole will close, this budget reverses that.

There are so many reasons for seniors and people with disabilities and people who care about Medicare to be concerned. Medicare is a bedrock of stability for our seniors, for their health, for their economic security, and for those with disabilities who depend on it. We must make sure that it is solvent, but we must not charge seniors more while giving bigger tax cuts to the wealthy.

Just remember these three points. First of all, it abolishes Medicare as we know it, increasing costs to seniors, while it gives tax breaks of tens of billions of dollars to Big Oil.

Changes in Medicaid will send seniors out of nursing homes while we give tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This Ryan budget, the Republican budget, will hurt education, cut the education of our children, increase the cost of higher education for young adults, 10 million young adults, while we give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That's just not the American way.

The President said in his remarks that we are about shared responsibility and shared sacrifice. We are about a sense of community in our country. And so as we want to reduce the deficit, the fiscal deficit, and we must, and we have proven, Democrats have proven that we can, this proposal does not.

But what Mr. VAN HOLLEN is proposing in the positive sense is recognizing that we need to reduce the deficit, growth is a part of that and so we have investments in education and the innovation that springs from that, and other initiatives that grow our economy, that strengthen the middle class, that creates jobs as it reduces the deficit.

I urge our colleagues to vote "yes" on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget and "no" on the Ryan budget to strengthen the middle class.

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

First, let me start off by saying that the only way the word "oil" is mentioned in this budget—it is not in the Tax Code—it is that we want to drill for more of it in this country so we can lower gas prices and get ourselves off foreign oil.

Let me address Medicare briefly. I have here the Federal Employee Benefit Handbook that everybody in Congress, every Federal employee has. Nowhere in this book does it say voucher. Look at all of these plans we get to choose from: Kaiser, Aetna, Humana, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Coventry, pages and pages of choices and options. This is what we're talking about for people 54 and below.

Guess what, the biggest threat to Medicare is the status quo. Medicare goes bankrupt in 9 years. And so, is this exactly like the Federal employee health plan? No, it is not. It is the same kind of plan because what we say is in the future, people who are wealthy don't need as much of a subsidy. People who are sick need more, people who are low-income need more, and they get complete out-of-pocket coverage. More for the sick, more for the poor, less for the wealthy, and a solvent Medicare system.

But more importantly, the people choose. Medicare beneficiaries choose. What's the President's plan? What's the Democrats' plan? Appoint 15 people to do the choosing. It is a different philosophy. Should we have 15 unelected bureaucrats run Medicare, ration Medicare, or should we allow 40 million to 50 million seniors make the decision?

Let's talk about taxes. Look at all of these budgets we've been looking at today. By the way, our budget doesn't even cut taxes. I wish I could say it does. Revenues still rise, about \$12 trillion under this budget. We just don't want to go up and up and up.

The budget we have here is a \$2 trillion tax increase; the plan we had before, the Progressive plan, a \$16 trillion tax increase; the Congressional Black Caucus budget, a \$6 trillion tax increase.

This budget cuts defense \$619 billion; the Progressive budget, \$1.2 trillion; the CBC budget cuts defense \$469 billion.

The CBC budget increases spending on domestic spending \$4.1 trillion. The Progressive Caucus increases domestic

spending \$11.4 trillion. The Democratic budget increases, relative to the mark, \$4.6 trillion.

So we've got it. We know where they are. More spending. More spending on everything, but cut and gut defense, and raise taxes a lot.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic alternative budget for FY 2012. With this budget, Congressman VAN HOLLEN has offered a responsible alternative to the dangerous Republican approach.

The Democratic alternative offers a dramatically different vision of America's future. It takes on our deficits, but not in a reckless way. It does so responsibly, so that we can continue investing in our economy and our people. It took us years to get into this fiscal challenge, and economists agree that it would be disastrous to try to get out of it overnight. But that is exactly what Republicans want to do. Democrats believe in a balanced approach that keeps our economy growing while getting us back to living within our means.

The Democratic alternative also allows us to keep the promise of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to our seniors, the disabled, and the poor. What our country needs is to get on a more responsible fiscal path. But we cannot afford to remake the social contract in a way that harms the least advantaged in our society. Democrats want to strengthen these programs—not destroy them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget is a responsible alternative to a Republican plan that would fundamentally alter the kind of society that we live in. Democrats reject the false choice between fiscal responsibility and our values. We are offering an opportunity to get serious about our deficits without turning our backs on those who can least afford it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Democratic budget.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 259, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—166

Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Deutch
Andrews	Chu	Dicks
Baca	Cielline	Dingell
Baldwin	Clarke (MI)	Doggett
Bass (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Doyle
Becerra	Clay	Edwards
Berkley	Cleaver	Ellison
Berman	Clyburn	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (NY)	Connolly (VA)	Farr
Blumenauer	Conyers	Fattah
Boswell	Costello	Filner
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Braley (IA)	Critz	Fudge
Brown (FL)	Crowley	Garamendi
Butterfield	Cummings	Gonzalez
Capps	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Capuano	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Carnahan	DeGette	Gutierrez
Carson (IN)	DeLauro	Hanabusa

Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta
Heinrich	McDermott	Sarbanes
Higgins	McGovern	Schakowsky
Himes	McNerney	Schiff
Hinchey	Michaud	Schwartz
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Hirono	Miller, George	Scott, David
Holden	Moore	Serrano
Holt	Moran	Sewell
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Sherman
Hoyer	Nadler	Sires
Inslee	Napolitano	Slaughter
Israel	Neal	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Speier
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Stark
(TX)	Pascrell	Sutton
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Pelosi	Tierney
Keating	Perlmutter	Tonko
Kildee	Peterson	Towns
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Tsongas
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Van Hollen
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Walz (MN)
Levin	Rahall	Wasserman
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Schultz
Lipinski	Reyes	Watt
Loeb sack	Richardson	Waxman
Lofgren, Zoe	Richmond	Weiner
Lowe y	Rothman (NJ)	Welch
Lujan	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Rush
Maloney	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
Markey	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Matsui	T.	Yarmuth
McCarthy (NY)		

NOES—259

Adams	DesJarlais	Jenkins
Akin	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (IL)
Alexander	Dold	Johnson (OH)
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Amash	Dreier	Jones
Austria	Duffy	Jordan
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Kelly
Bachus	Duncan (TN)	Kind
Barletta	Ellmers	King (NY)
Barrow	Emerson	Kingston
Bartlett	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton (TX)	Fincher	Kissell
Bass (NH)	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Benishek	Flake	Kucinich
Berg	Fleischmann	Labrador
Biggert	Fleming	Lamborn
Bilbray	Flores	Lance
Bilirakis	Forbes	Landry
Black	Fortenberry	Lankford
Blackburn	Fox	Latham
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	LaTourette
Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Boren	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Gardner	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Long
Brooks	Gerlach	Lucas
Broun (GA)	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Buchanan	Gibson	Lummis
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Buerkle	Gohmert	E.
Burgess	Goodlatte	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gosar	Manzullo
Calvert	Gowdy	Marchant
Camp	Granger	Marino
Campbell	Graves (GA)	Matheson
Canseco	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
Cantor	Green, Gene	McCauley
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McClintock
Cardoza	Griffith (VA)	McCotter
Carney	Grimm	McHenry
Carter	Guinta	McIntyre
Cassidy	Guthrie	McKeon
Chabot	Hall	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hanna	McMorris
Chandler	Harper	Rodgers
Coble	Harris	Meehan
Coffman (CO)	Hartzler	Mica
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Heck	Miller, Gary
Costa	Heller	Mulvaney
Covaca	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Herger	Merrick
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Huelskamp	Noem
Culberson	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Davis (KY)	Hultgren	Nunes
Hunter	Hunter	Nunnelee
Hurt	Hurt	Olson
Issa	Issa	Palazzo

Paul	Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman
Paulsen	Roskam	Sullivan
Pearce	Ross (AR)	Terry
Pence	Ross (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Peters	Royce	Thornberry
Petri	Runyan	Tiberi
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Platts	Scalise	Turner
Poe (TX)	Schilling	Upton
Pompeo	Schmidt	Visclosky
Posey	Schock	Walberg
Price (GA)	Schrader	Walden
Quayle	Schweikert	Walsh (IL)
Reed	Scott (SC)	Waters
Rehberg	Scott, Austin	Webster
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	West
Ribble	Sessions	Westmoreland
Rigell	Shimkus	Whitfield
Rivera	Shuler	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Shuster	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Young (AK)
Rokita	Stearns	Young (FL)
Rooney	Stivers	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Aderholt	King (IA)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Meeks	
Giffords	Olver	

□ 1312

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BALDWIN, Messrs. POLIS, COSTELLO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 276, I was detained by two (2) elevators which were in use by non-Members during votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider 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 gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by first thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, and the entire Budget staff. I would also like to thank the Democrat members on the Budget Committee as well.

What we are taking up today is the point of where this country goes. Because this debate has gone on for quite some time, there is probably not one person in America that has not watched the news and watched the clock of our debt of \$14 trillion.

I want you all to imagine for one moment, just imagine for one moment, what the future of this country would hold in the dreams if that clock was zero. What could we invest in? What could we build? And what would our

children become? But because that clock does not say zero and that clock continues to climb in the wrong direction, that's why we are here today. But it is a good day because today is the day that we turn that clock back around.

We have a plan and a Path to Prosperity that will create jobs—even those on the outside that looked at it said there will be more than 1 million jobs, a plan that will make us energy independent, but also a plan that does something the rest of America has to do as well: tighten our belts.

So today, when we come and have to put our card in the voting slot, I want you to think of one thing: Today could be the day that we create the great America comeback, or it could be the day that America goes into the long fade into history. The floor is made up of a microcosm of America, and all of America knows that we have to control the situation we are in.

So today, a "yes" vote is for jobs, for energy independence, and a new Path to Prosperity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we are turning back the clock. We're turning back the clock on progress and we're turning back the clock—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, what the Republican budget does is turn back the clock on a fair deal for the American people.

Every person in this body today loves this great Nation of ours and believes it's a special place. We have to maintain the dynamism and exceptionalism of this country. We see different paths and make different choices to accomplish that goal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my question is about the clarification of the rules. The rules also, for our visiting guests, allow the Sergeant at Arms to clear the Chamber, if necessary. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. It is within the authority of the Chair to clear the gallery.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the Chairman.

I would just encourage those to continue the civil conversation that we are having about a very difficult conversation in our country.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order, and would affirm to all Members that the Chair has the authority to clear the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree we have to act now to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

□ 1320

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to begin my remarks from the beginning and reset the clock.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues.

As I said, nobody doubts that every person in this Chamber loves this country and wants to do the right thing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery, which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm tempted to reserve my time and yield it back to the other—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair makes this announcement for purposes of possible prosecution.

The gentleman from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I said, I was tempted to reserve my time and allow my colleague to proceed. But as I understand the Chamber is now quiet, let me begin where I left off and say that all of us agree, everybody in this Chamber agrees, we need to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit in a predictable, steady manner. The question throughout this debate has been not whether, but how we do that. And as the bipartisan fiscal commission has indicated, any responsible effort requires a balanced approach.

And the Republican plan simply fails on that score. And that's what the co-chairs of the bipartisan fiscal commission said. They said it, "falls short of the balanced, comprehensive approach needed for a responsible plan." And when you peel off the layers, what you find is the Republican plan is not bold. It's just the same old, tired formula we've seen before of providing big tax breaks to the very wealthy and powerful special interests at the expense of the rest of America—except this time it's dressed up with a lot of sweet-sounding talk of reform. But at the end, it's the same old ideological agenda—except this time on steroids.

To govern is to choose. Each of us is sent here to make difficult choices, and the choices that are made in the Republican plan we believe are wrong for America.

We do not believe it's courageous to protect tax giveaways to big oil companies and other special interests when we're slashing investments in our kids' education, scientific research, and critical investments in the future.

We don't think it's bold to provide another tax break to millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking seniors with the bill for ever-rising health care costs.

We do not believe it's visionary to award corporations that ship American jobs rather than American products overseas while we're terminating affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans right here at home.

And we don't think it's brave to give Governors a blank check of Federal taxpayer dollars and then a license to cut support for seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and poor kids.

And we don't think it's fair to raise taxes on middle-income Americans to pay for additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

□ 1330

Yet those are the choices that are made in the Republican budget. Where is the shared sacrifice? We have American men and women putting their lives on the line in Iraq, in Afghanistan, while others hide their income in the Cayman Islands and Switzerland and refuse to pay their fair share to support our national efforts. And that is why the bipartisan commission, among other reasons, said that the Republican plan is just not balanced. It's not.

Let's say "no" to the Republican plan. Let's say "yes" to finding a balanced way to reduce our deficits in a way that protects the values and priorities of the American people and in a way that gets our economy moving and America back to work.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week, USA Today reported that we have the fewest participants in our workforce than at any time in 30 years. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to increase taxes \$1.5 trillion on our economy, much of it on our small businesses.

The Congressional Budget Office has announced that Medicare is going broke in 2020. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to double down on the rationing of health care for our seniors.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office has announced that Social Security will go broke in 2037. And my Democratic colleagues have announced this is not a problem. We're ready to implement the 22 percent benefit cut that's already in our statute.

Survey after survey shows that our fellow citizens believe that their children will be worse off than they are, and yet my Democrat colleagues announced their plan to add \$9.1 trillion to the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to quit spending money we don't have. It's time to quit borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and then send the bill to our children and grandchildren.

The Republican budget will help us create jobs with fundamental tax reform in preventing these tax increases. It will save our social safety net programs. Programs that have been of a great comfort to my parents and

grandparents before our eyes are morphing into cruel Ponzi schemes for my third-grade daughter and my first-grade son. And, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget will put us on the path to pay off the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I heard from one of my constituents recently. He said, I never felt so embarrassed and ashamed of anything I have done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlyn, my precious grandkids. I have written them both 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, I have got a message for Mr. Calhoun. Put that letter away. House Republicans are going to stand for Tyler and Caitlyn. We're going to put America back to work. We're going to save the social safety net and preserve the American Dream for ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it's hard to see how someone would define saving the social safety net by ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors, by slashing Medicaid by over \$750 billion, a program that disproportionately helps seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. It's really hard to understand how that is preserving the social safety net. It reminds me of that strange statement we once heard that you have to destroy the village in order to save it.

Now, let's understand what happens under this budget to Medicare. This budget ends the Medicare guarantee for seniors. It doesn't reform Medicare; it deforms and dismantles it because it forces seniors off the Medicare program, into the private insurance market.

And it does nothing, as it dumps the seniors into the private insurance market, to control the rate of increase in health care costs. Instead, it transfers to the senior all those risks and all those costs. Seniors will pay a lot more, while the insurance companies will get all their Medicare payroll taxes. They'll get a bonanza out of this thing, but seniors will be left holding the bag.

If your voucher amount, call it whatever you want, is not sufficient to pay for the increased cost, you eat it. And we saw earlier the fact that by the year 2022 seniors will have to pay more than \$6,000 above what they would have had to pay under the regular Medicare program. If your doctor's not on a private plan that you can afford, tough luck. This is rationing health care by income, nothing more.

And I want to say something just to clear the record one more time. We keep hearing that they're offering seniors exactly what Members of Congress get. It simply is not true. What Members of Congress get is what's called a fair share deal. I encourage my colleagues on all sides of the aisle just to look at the Federal Employees Benefit Plan. And you look in the Office of Per-

sonnel and it says: "This formula is known as the fair share formula because it will maintain a consistent level of government contributions as a percentage of program costs regardless of what plan the enrollees elect." And it says that the government contribution equals the lesser of 72 percent of the amounts OPM determines are program-wide, or 75 percent.

The point is Members of Congress get a fair share formula. The Republican budget does not give a fair share formula to seniors on Medicare. It just doesn't. In fact, the way it saves money is to give them an unfair deal. It unconnects the support we give to seniors from rising health care costs. That's why seniors will end up paying so much more and more and more, because you make the savings—health care costs are going up like this, and the support, if you want to call it support, it's really not coming from the Medicare program or the Federal Government, is going like this. That's why the seniors are having to eat those additional costs. That is what the Republican budget does. At the same time they do provide additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

If you want to get rid of some of the junk in the Tax Code, you can support the Democratic plan, because we got rid of subsidies for the oil companies. We got rid of those perverse tax incentives to reward corporations that are shipping American jobs instead of American products overseas.

So if you want to start with tax reform, vote for the Democratic plan. Those are the choices we made, not ending the Medicare guarantee.

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his outstanding leadership and all the hard work he has shown in leading this effort to put together a budget for this House. I also want to commend the hard work of his members in the committee for bringing this forward.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is broke. We borrow nearly 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Our debt is more than \$14 trillion and is averaging yearly trillion-dollar deficits. We simply cannot afford to keep spending money we don't have, and we must bring down the debt.

Now, for years this House, including legislators on both sides of the aisle, has kicked the can down the road. Americans were led to believe that we could spend hundreds of billions of dollars that we don't have and that there would be no consequences. And when it came to fostering an environment where American business could compete in a global economy, we became complacent. This must stop.

□ 1340

It's time to be honest with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, we stand at a crossroads. Before us lie two divergent paths: one defined by crushing debt, slow growth and diminished opportunity; and one defined by achievement, innovation and American leadership.

By demonstrating courage and directly confronting our challenge at this critical moment, we can fulfill the promise of America and pass on to our children a Nation that offers everyone a fair shot at earning their success.

The House Republican budget is an honest, fact-based proposal that details our vision for managing down our debt and growing our way back to prosperity.

First, we will stop spending money that we don't have. This budget cuts non-security discretionary spending to below 2008 levels and freezes it for 5 years. Overall, we reach \$6.2 trillion in savings against the President's budget.

Second, we will lead where the President has failed by finally addressing our insolvent entitlement programs. We know that these programs are the biggest drivers of our debt, and the Congressional Budget Office acknowledges that if we don't take action, these important safety net programs will go broke.

We cannot afford to ignore this oncoming fiscal train wreck any longer. While it may be seen by some as politically risky, we Republicans are willing to lead, because, to be frank, complacency is not an option.

To be clear, our plan will not touch benefits for today's seniors and those nearing retirement. For those of us 54 and below, it calls for reforms that will restructure Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that these safety nets will still be there for those who need it, not for those who don't.

Unlike the lofty outline the President gave in his speech this week, our budget is not a political document. We do not dream up imaginary savings and dodge specifics in an effort to lull people into the belief that they can actually get things for nothing. Our budget is a concrete plan for getting our fiscal house in order, and we do not resort to tax increases on the very small businesses and job creators we need to put America back to work.

Bringing down the debt sends a message to American families. It sends a message to businessmen and -women, to entrepreneurs and to investors. It gives them the confidence that they won't face a future plagued by inflation, higher taxes and higher interest rates.

We understand that cutting spending alone is not enough. That's why our budget calls for pro-growth policies to get our economy growing and get people back to work.

Families and small business people are struggling, and today, Tax Day, millions of them will send their hard-earned money to Uncle Sam. The last thing we should be asking them to do is to send yet again more. Instead, our

budget calls for a more competitive tax system that will encourage the economy to grow, create jobs and spur investment in the private sector.

We call for the end of crony capitalism that allows privileged industries to gain competitive advantage in our Tax Code, and we call for a more simple system that lowers rates for all but makes sure everyone pays their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, with this budget, House Republicans are changing the culture in Washington from one of spending to one of savings.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, America will see that it can get its fiscal house in order after years of mismanagement. We are finally doing what families and small business people have been doing for years: tightening the belt and learning how to do more with less.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman RYAN and his committee for their outstanding leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, the American people understand that we can't continue to spend money that we don't have. Our national debt has now surpassed \$14.2 trillion, and it's on a track to eclipse the entire size of our economy.

This massive debt that we are incurring hurts private sector job creation, eroding confidence, spreading uncertainty amongst employers big and small, and discouraging private investment in our economy that is sorely needed in order for us to create jobs.

This debt is also a moral threat to our country. In my opinion, it is immoral to rob our children's and grandchildren's future and leave them beholden to countries around the world who buy our debt. We have a moral obligation to speak the truth and to do something about it.

Yesterday, we took the first step in beginning to address this massive debt by passing legislation that will reduce our deficit by \$315 billion over the next 10 years. It was an imperfect bill, but it was a positive step that has cleared the decks and allowed us to focus on cutting trillions of dollars, not just billions.

Chairman RYAN and the members of the Budget Committee have done an excellent job of putting together a budget that's worthy of the American people. This budget will help job creation today, lift the crushing burden of debt that threatens our children's future, and preserve and protect programs like Medicare and Medicaid. Most importantly, the budget shows families and small businesses that we're serious about dealing with America's spending illness so we can put our country on a path to prosperity.

The Ryan budget sets the bar for the debate going forward. President Obama had an opportunity to match it. Unfortunately, he gave a partisan speech about the need for more spending, more taxing, and more borrowing. He said he wants to target our debt problem through a so-called "debt fail-safe," but exempts the major entitlement programs that account for most of the long-term debt problems. And he proposed yet another commission, though he ignored the recommendations of this last one.

Instead of offering serious solutions, the President asked Congress to raise the debt limit without addressing Washington's spending problem. The President wants a clean bill, and the American people will not tolerate it.

Now, let me be clear: There will be no debt limit increase unless it's accompanied by serious spending cuts and real budget reforms.

We delivered this message on Wednesday morning to the President. We cannot continue to borrow recklessly and dig ourselves a deeper hole and mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. The American people are looking for leadership to address this debt crisis. Unfortunately, the President has failed to put a serious proposal on the table. If the President won't lead, we will.

□ 1350

No more kicking the can down the road. No more whistling past the graveyard. Now is the time to address the serious challenges that face the American people. And we will.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that even if we adopt the Republican budget, we're going to have to lift the debt ceiling for years and years to come. So let's not play Russian roulette with the economy and the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Now, on the question of jobs—the question of jobs—during the Clinton administration, we asked the very wealthiest for a little bit more sacrifice than they have today. And do you know what happened to jobs? Twenty million jobs were created during the Clinton administration. Under the current tax rates, after 8 years of George Bush, the private sector lost 630,000 jobs.

So you see the pattern here. During the Clinton administration, economic growth was booming, and 20 million jobs were created. During the 8 years of the Bush administration, there was a net loss of 653,000 jobs. We need to continue to invest in this country and make sure that the entrepreneurs of this country can continue to thrive. We need to do this in a balanced way.

I would point out that the folks who said that this Republican plan we are debating would increase jobs are the same people who predicted that the Bush tax cuts would create jobs. That's the blue line. That's the prediction of the Heritage Foundation about what

would happen. The red is the reality. If we want to create jobs and reduce the deficit, we need to do it in a balanced way. That's what the fiscal commission said. That's what the Democratic plan does.

We urge everyone, respectfully, to vote "no" on the Republican plan. It's the wrong choice for America.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing a budget proposal to the floor today that is a statement of our national values and about what we care about: investing in our children, honoring our seniors, creating jobs, growing the economy and strengthening the middle class. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for your great leadership in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, today we will be taking a vote that is very, very important for the health and security of American seniors. A great deal is at stake. I'm just going to focus on one part of this Republican budget. I want to say to my Republican colleagues, Do you realize that your leadership is asking you to cast a vote today to abolish Medicare as we know it? Because that is the vote that we have. This is not about an issue; this is about a value. This is about an ethic. Medicare is a core value of our social compact with the American people. Yet this budget shreds that contract which is part of the strength of our country. The Republican proposal breaks the promise that our country has made to our seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement.

This plan, the Republican plan, ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces them to pay more to buy their insurance from health insurance companies, where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit. I want to repeat that: the Republican plan forces seniors to buy their insurance from health insurance companies where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefits, as much as \$20,000 per year more for some seniors.

This plan has the wrong priority for our seniors and for all Americans. Just remember these three things about the Republican budget: It ends Medicare as we know it as it gives big tax breaks and subsidies—tens of billions of dollars—to Big Oil. This budget reduces Medicaid for our seniors in nursing homes, sending them away from nursing homes, while it gives tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This budget hurts our children's education. In fact, it increases the cost of higher education for nearly 10 million of our young adults, while it gives tax

breaks to America's wealthiest families. That's just not fair. It is just not the American way.

Here we are. Yesterday, we observed the 100th day of the Republican majority in Congress. In those 100 days, not one job has been created. Not one job agenda is in the works. And what are we doing? We are here to abolish Medicare instead.

I have heard our colleagues say that the budget deficit is immoral. It's been immoral for the 8 years of the Bush administration, and I didn't hear anybody say "boo" while we were giving tax cuts to the rich, having two wars unpaid for, and giving prescription drug bills to the private sector.

Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We have demonstrated that we can during the Clinton administration, and we will. We are committed to strengthening the middle class, to growing our economy as we reduce the deficit, and to creating jobs. The Republican budget fails to do that, and the Republican budget will not have Democratic support.

We are here, and as one of the previous speakers said, now is the time. Now is the time to preserve Medicare. And Democrats will. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our staffs, the Democratic staff and the Republican staff, for all of their hard work in getting us to this moment.

I want to ask my colleagues a question. I want to ask the American people a question. I remember one of the worst moments I had in Congress was the financial crisis of 2008. It seems like it was yesterday. We had the Treasury Secretary and we had the Federal Reserve chairman coming here talking about crisis and talking about bank collapses. And what came out of that was really ugly legislation that we passed on a bipartisan basis but no one enjoyed. That crisis caught us by surprise. It was unpredictable. We didn't see it coming.

Let me ask you this. What if your President and your Member of Congress saw it coming? What if they knew why it was happening, when it was going to happen, and more importantly, they knew what to do to stop it and they had time to stop it, but they didn't? Because of politics? What would you think of that person?

Mr. Chairman, that is where we are right now.

This is the most predictable economic crisis we've ever had in the history of this country. Yet we have a President who is unwilling to lead. We have too many politicians worried about the next election and not worried about the next generation. Every politician in this town knows we have a debt crisis. They know that we are in danger.

We cannot avoid this choice. To govern is to choose. We are making a

choice even if we don't act. And that's the wrong choice. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. Will we be remembered as the Congress that did nothing as the Nation sped toward a preventable debt crisis and irreversible decline? Or will we instead be remembered as a Congress that did the hard work of preventing that crisis, the one that chose this Path to Prosperity? This Path to Prosperity charts a different course. It gets us off this wrong track.

It achieves four objectives:

Number one, grow the economy and get people back to work.

Number two, fulfill the mission of health and retirement security. We don't want to ration Medicare. We don't want to see Medicare go bankrupt. We want to save Medicare.

Number three, repair the social safety net. Get it ready for the 21st century. We don't want a welfare system that encourages people to stay on welfare. We want them to get back on their feet and into flourishing, self-sufficient lives. So let's reform welfare for people who need it, and let's end corporate welfare for people who don't need it.

□ 1400

Number four, let's do the work of lifting this crushing burden of debt from our children.

This is what we achieve. We have a choice of two futures, but we have to make the right choice. We must not leave this Nation in decline. We must not be the first generation of this country to leave the next generation worse off. Decline is antithetical to the American idea. America is a Nation conceived in liberty, dedicated to equality and defined by limitless opportunity. Equal opportunity, upward mobility, prosperity; this is what America is all about.

In all the chapters of human history, there has never been anything quite like America. This budget keeps America exceptional. It preserves its promise for the next generation. Colleagues, this is our defining moment. We must choose this Path to Prosperity.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, 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. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013

through 2021, and, pursuant to House Resolution 223, reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—235

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

Thornberry	Walsh (IL)
Tiberi	Webster
Tipton	West
Turner	Westmoreland
Upton	Whitfield
Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Walden	Wittman

NAYS—193

Ackerman	Gonzalez
Altmire	Green, Al
Andrews	Green, Gene
Baca	Grijalva
Baldwin	Gutierrez
Barrow	Hanabusa
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Heinrich
Berkley	Higgins
Berman	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Hinchev
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Hirono
Boren	Holden
Boswell	Holt
Brady (PA)	Honda
Brale (IA)	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Inslie
Butterfield	Israel
Capps	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Jackson Lee
Cardoza	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Jones
Castor (FL)	Kaptur
Chandler	Keating
Chu	Kildee
Cielline	Kind
Clarke (MI)	Kissell
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clayburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Lee (CA)
Connolly (VA)	Levin
Conyers	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski
Costa	Loeb
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowey
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Lynch
Cuellar	Maloney
Cummings	Markey
Davis (CA)	Matheson
Davis (IL)	Matsui
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)
DeGette	McCollum
DeLauro	McDermott
Deutch	McGovern
Dicks	McIntyre
Dingell	McKinley
Doggett	McNerney
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud
Doyle	Miller (NC)
Edwards	Miller, George
Ellison	Moore
Engel	Moran
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)
Farr	Nadler
Fattah	Napolitano
Finer	Neal
Frank (MA)	Owens
Fudge	Pallone
Garamendi	Pascarella

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords	Olver
Meeks	Reichert

□ 1423

Mr. LAMBORN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION OF MEMBERS OF STAFF

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank all of our hardworking staff in our office and on the House Budget Committee, who put in long hours, dedicated years of expertise to making this budget possible, to making this budget passable—to making this moment happen.

I want to thank Budjon Burks, Eric Davis, Vanessa Day, Marsha Douglas, Tim Flynn, Nicole Foltz, Jose Guillen, Jim Herz, Matt Hoffmann, Charlotte Ivancic, Pat Knudsen, Jane Lee, Dick Magee, Ted McCann, Andy Morton, Courtney Reinhard, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, Austin Smythe—our staff director—Jenna Spealman, Stephen Spruiell, Conor Sweeney, Dennis Teti, Dana Wade. I call him “John Z,” but it’s John Zakrajsek. That’s an inside joke. Brad Butler, Jonathan Golster, Spencer Pepper, Alex Stoddard.

I also want to thank from our personal office:

Smythe Anderson, Laurie Krmptich, Joyce Meyer, Sarah Peer, Mark Positano, Kevin Seifert, Martin Skold, Andy Speth—my chief of staff—Allison Steil; our interns: Brad Kirschbaum, Jane McEaney, David Pelsue, Greg Spevacek, and John Watts.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of the hardworking staff for making this possible.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, AND H.R. 1216

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file its reports to accompany H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, and H.R. 1216 at any time through Wednesday, April 27, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. BECERRA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST ME-
MORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. GRIMM, New York
Ms. HAYWORTH, New York
Mr. MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
Mr. WAXMAN, California
Ms. GIFFORDS, Arizona

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER
MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 431 note, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. THORNBERY, Texas
Mr. SIMPSON, Idaho
Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
HOUSE COMMISSION ON CON-
GRESSIONAL MAILING STAND-
ARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. SCHOCK, Illinois, Chairman
Mr. PRICE, Georgia
Mr. LATTA, Ohio
Mrs. DAVIS, California
Mr. SHERMAN, California
Mr. RICHMOND, Louisiana

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVA-
TION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

Mr. WITTMAN, Virginia
Mr. DINGELL, Michigan

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. DREIER, California, Chairman

Mr. McCAUL, Texas

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED
STATES MERCHANT MARINE
ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. KING, New York
Mrs. MCCARTHY, New York

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO
CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois, Chairman

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED
STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. COBLE, North Carolina
Mr. COURTNEY, Connecticut

CONGRATULATING THE BAYLOR
UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKET-
BALL TEAM

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Baylor University women's basketball team on an outstanding 2011 season. I don't believe that there are many Members of this body who have the honor to represent two great schools that made it to the NCAA Elite Eight in this year's NCAA Women's Tournament. This trip to the Elite Eight is part of their winning tradition that includes a national championship in 2005.

Coach Kim Mulkey and the Lady Bears deserve high praise on winning this year's Big 12 Championship and advancing to the Elite Eight for the second straight year. Sophomore post Brittany Griner was also named as a first-team All American.

Congratulations to the Baylor Lady Bears on a great season, and Sic'em Bears.

□ 1430

HONORING JUDGE WILLIAM HART
RUFÉ III

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge William Hart Rufe III for 36 years of outstanding service to the Heritage Conservancy based in my home of Bucks County.

Headquartered in the county seat of Doylestown, the Heritage Conservancy is an organization that specializes in open space preservation, planning for sustainable communities and natural resource protection. As a vocal advocate for the preservation of farmland, parkland and critical natural areas during my time as county commissioner, I have a personal appreciation for the mission of the conservancy.

Judge Rufe has been an important partner in working to stop suburban sprawl from transforming the beauty of the Bucks County landscape. His decades of leadership in this organization have been invaluable, and he will be missed as the Heritage Conservancy continues its important work.

AMERICAN FILM COMPANY

(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, recent studies have shown that there is an epidemic of historical and political ignorance in our country and that an alarming 83 percent of Americans fail a basic test on knowledge of the American Revolution and the principles that have united all Americans. It is for this reason that I rise today to acknowledge the exciting work of the American Film Company, founded in 2008 by entrepreneur Joe Ricketts.

Mr. Ricketts founded the company on the belief that real life is often more compelling than fiction, and so he set out to produce films about the incredible true stories from America's past. Central to the company's filmmaking are prominent historians, assuring that each production remains true and historically accurate.

As a resident of the great State of Illinois, I was pleased that the first film produced by the American Film Company was "The Conspirator," which tells the true story of Mary Surratt, the lone woman accused of participating in the conspiracy to assassinate President Abraham Lincoln. Fittingly, the film premiered last Sunday at Ford's Theater.

I commend the American Film Company for finding an entertaining way to encourage and educate Americans about our country's important history, and I congratulate Mr. Ricketts as well.

BUDGET

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last 48 hours, this House engaged in its constitutional right of creating a pathway for revenue for the United States of America. Sadly, we ended just a few minutes ago on a Republican budget that cannot claim that it will, in essence, reduce the deficit or create a surplus in any given year.

I am delighted to have supported the Democratic budget that reduces the deficit and reaches a primary balance by 2018. But more importantly, I think I am very delighted that the American people will see a heart in this budget: that we will not destroy Medicare; that we will not burden on seniors the extra \$12,000 that seniors will have to pay—that is right, \$12,000—in the Medicare program under the Republican plan; and that young people will not be prevented at the doors of colleges from going to school, and that Head Start will end and Medicaid for the disabled and seniors will end.

I do have faith in this country, and I believe we will get a budget that is both merciful and balanced the right way for the American people, not the wrong way. Today, unfortunately, we made a wrong step, but I believe together we will make it right.

BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STIVERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently I have given several Special Order speeches about my view of the Constitution, making the argument for why I think it should be amended to include certain basic rights for the American people that they currently lack. These include: the right to a high-quality education, the right to health care, and equal rights for women.

Equal rights for women, alone, Mr. Speaker, would be responsible for providing an extraordinary amount of income for 51 percent of households headed by women if women in our society were simply paid at the same rate that their counterparts in the workforce are paid. Equal rights. Equal rights for women, alone, as a fundamental right, would strengthen our economy.

This afternoon, my Special Order time will be used to discuss the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011, the Republican proposed fiscal year 2012 budget, which we just voted on, and the balanced budget amendment, or what I've taken to call the "imbalanced budget" amendment. All three of them have something in common.

In an ideal world, my colleague PAUL RYAN would support the idea of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, but such an amendment would have extraordinary implications for our country, extraordinary implications for our Federal Government, and it would be fundamentally in the wrong direction.

And while the Republican proposed budget of fiscal year 2012 does not have the strength of the Constitution of the United States, it is clear to me that Republicans and conservatives in the Republican Party—and some conservatives within the Democratic Party—are forcing the Nation's politics into a consideration of a balanced budget amendment for the Constitution. And I want to talk about that in the context of the 2011 debate, the context of the 2012 debate, and such an amendment.

Before I begin, I want to set the framework for my Special Order.

President Harry Truman, in 1946, said, "All of the policies of the Federal Government must be geared to the objective of sustained full production and full employment."

Today, our country has unemployment that is nearing 9 percent; unemployment nearing 9 percent. Nearly 13 to 14 million Americans are presently unemployed—many of whom are chronically unemployed—and yet, in 1946, President Harry Truman said that the objective of the Federal Government must be "sustained full production and full employment to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment." There has not been a single bill in this Congress since the 112th Congress has begun to address the issue of full employment.

Secondly, I want to remind the American people, Mr. Speaker, of what William Jennings Bryan said in 1896. He said: I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man or a woman who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him or her, I find a man or a woman who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that would have forced middle class and working class Americans to carry the burden of spending cuts. My colleagues across the aisle simplified the impacts of this measure by describing it as "tightening our belts." They seem to be oblivious to the fact that these cuts went deep for those Americans who could least afford them.

H.R. 1—tightening our belts—slashed programs like community health centers specifically designed to provide access to basic health and dental services to underserved communities that may not be otherwise able to care for them.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts through cuts to the National Institutes of Health, setting back development of cancer treatments and cures for other diseases, the impact of which we will feel for years to come as medical professionals are forced to shut down promising research projects.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by hacking away at training of health professions, reducing this funding by more than 23 percent. Cuts to title VII and title VIII programs that help to train primary health professionals for underserved areas would limit the access of low-income individuals to quality doctors, nurses and physician assistants in their areas.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by severing title X family planning programs. In doing so, we stepped back in time, preventing lifesaving care from being offered to our Nation's women, specifically women who wouldn't otherwise have access to this kind of care.

The programs I've listed so far provide health services to our Nation, and especially to our most underprivileged populations.

□ 1440

H.R. 1 also tightened our belts with cuts to job-training programs, Head Start, and after-school programs, Pell Grants, Hope VI housing programs, and high-speed rail. These programs were systematically sent to the guillotine.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR
OF H.R. 1081

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1081.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The people that they serve are not millionaires to whom we generously extended tax cuts. They are not the corporations that eagerly navigate tax loopholes, navigate the walls and the Halls of this Congress every year, costing our Nation billions in revenue. They are everyday, hard-working, middle class, public school educated, checkbook balancing, minimum wage earning mothers and fathers and grandparents who elected each of us, hoping we'd find a way to decrease unemployment and bring America back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, thankfully our colleagues across the Capitol thought we went a few notches too tight in our belt with H.R. 1, as the Senate refused to take up these cuts. Much of our future long-term budget decisions and discussions to reduce our deficit and get America back on track remain in limbo.

Recently, this discussion had reached a fevered pitch. After multiple short-term extensions of the fiscal year 2011 appropriations legislation, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID, and the President had broken down many times throughout the week. We were faced with the threat of the first government shutdown since 1996. Agencies were planning which workers to furlough, national parks and museums were prepared to shut their doors for the weekend, and the

brave men and women in active duty and service to our Nation were prepared to continue their work without pay.

Then at the 11th hour, there was a breakthrough. The 5½-month continuing resolution agreed to by the leadership of the House and the Senate and the President included a total of \$39 billion worth of cuts.

But these cuts that were agreed to late into Friday have real consequences. There are significant cuts to programs like WIC, Women, Infants and Children, the special supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children; Community Health Centers; Low-income Heating and Energy Assistance Programs, LIHEAP; international disaster assistance; and Head Start.

And after the President and congressional leadership agreed to giving \$800 billion in tax cuts to America's top wage earners last December, we turned around and cut programs that working families and seniors depend on. It just doesn't make sense to me, Mr. Speaker.

Again, while I was relieved that the Federal Government did not shut down, I am deeply disappointed in the process that has brought us this so-called "compromise," if you can even call it that. Like the negotiations that held up tax cuts for the middle class at the end of last year to hold out for tax cuts for the wealthy, our leadership has again demonstrated that they're willing to hold up programs that provide for the most vulnerable Americans. And this Congress is only just beginning.

As for next fiscal year's budget, there are a variety of solutions that have been presented—some with potential to succeed, others destined to fail.

Among the proposals lie Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's recent offering. Look at the facts. His proposal will reduce our Nation's deficit, but leaves us asking the question, At what cost?

First and foremost, Mr. RYAN intends to place the burden of ending our Nation's debt on the citizens least capable of caring for themselves, the most reliant on the help of others—our seniors. The Budget Committee's proposal will end the Medicare our senior citizens have come to know and rely on, replacing it with what can only be described as a coupon, a voucher, that, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, would leave our eldest Americans shouldering 68 percent of their health care costs in the next 20 years.

Who else pays the cost of balancing our budget within the Ryan proposal? The burden falls next to working American families. The Ryan proposal will lower tax rates for individuals with the highest income as well as corporations, relying on raising taxes for the average Americans to pay for it.

If it sounds familiar, it's because it's the same standby trickle-down failure that we placed our faith in in the past decade. Despite what Majority Leader

CANTOR says, during an economic downturn, decreasing the deficit does not create jobs. Also, cutting taxes does not create jobs. Both Presidents Bush and Obama have cut taxes so much that if Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR's theory were correct, we would have zero unemployment, which we do not have. This is what the Ryan plan aims to do.

For 10 years our economy has stagnated. The gap between the median wage and average wage is growing because the highest earners are the only ones receiving wage increases. Unfortunately, balancing our Nation's budget on the backs of the middle class does not end there.

Where else would the burden of balancing the budget fall under the Ryan plan? Education. Cuts to K-12 education are just the starting point in disadvantaging the future of America. The proposal also makes significant cuts to Pell Grants. These cuts will prevent the educated generation of young Americans our country needs to compete in a global economy. The proposed cuts to Pell Grants would return the maximum award allowable to pre-stimulus levels, impacting millions of young Americans depending on financial assistance to attend college. This will stretch the time it will take for them to earn their degrees and enter the workforce.

Finally, RYAN's budget continues to provide tax loopholes to big oil companies and cuts all Federal support for clean energy, shortsighting our economic investments in the future of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not promoting constant Federal debt. I am not advocating against hoping or trying for a balanced budget. But when you look through history and the history of our Nation, we see that when Americans were in most need during war or recession, during the Great Depression, we focused on solving these problems, not just on reducing our debt.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in two wars and fighting our way out of the worst recession of the modern era. The Ryan budget is a new attempt at an age-old ploy to mandate a balanced budget for the Federal Government. Ending our Nation's deficit and returning our country to prosperity should, of course, be the goal. But we must also ask the question, At what cost? Where do our priorities lie?

The Ryan proposal, like the myriad of constitutional amendments before it, attempts to balance our budget on the backs of those Americans who can least bear the burden.

Here's the history of the balanced budget amendment. The current budget situation is most poignant when looking at the origins of the balanced budget amendment and its history. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleagues across the aisle present the Republican Study Committee's budget this morning, I'm apt to wonder what it is that they're actually studying

over there. Hopefully, we will be able to set the record straight.

As a reaction to FDR's New Deal, Republican Congressman Harold Knutson of Minnesota introduced the first version of the amendment in 1936. Like many constitutional amendments, this resolution did not receive a hearing or a vote.

During President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first term, the Judiciary Committee of a barely Democratic Senate held its first hearing on this amendment. It again did not receive a vote.

After these partial defeats, the balanced budget amendment supporters shifted their focus to the States. From 1975 to 1980, 30 State legislatures passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention to propose this amendment directly to the States; that is, they sought to bypass Congress and the congressional amendment process.

The election of President Reagan and a Republican Senate in 1980 renewed hopes for a balanced budget amendment and passage by Congress. While the Senate did adopt the amendment in 1982, it failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority in the House. This failure energized conservative groups such as the National Taxpayers Union and the National Tax Limitation Committee to refocus on State action.

In 1982 and 1983, the Alaska and Missouri legislatures passed a resolution supporting the BBA, bringing the total number of these resolutions to 32, two short of the 34 needed for a convention.

However, a growing concern about the scope of a constitutional convention led some States to withdraw their resolutions, reshifting focus to congressional action.

□ 1450

From 1990 to 1994, Congress would make three additional attempts to codify this amendment. All failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority. However, the BBA made a comeback when it was included in Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. Twenty-six days after taking office, the newly empowered Republican majority adopted the balanced budget amendment, giving conservatives their first congressional win in a decade. Disappointment awaited in the Senate, however, where two separate votes fell just short of adoption. This failure, along with the balanced budget and the budget surplus at the end of the decade, sapped any remaining congressional support for a balanced budget amendment.

There was renewed energy from Republican support for the amendment in 2000 as it was included in their party's platform. The Bush tax cuts, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the massive deficit spending created by them eventually led Republicans to sweep the idea of a balanced budget amendment back under the rug. By 2004, the Republican Party left any mention of a balanced budget out of their political platform.

Again in recent years, with the advent of the tea party and the return of

extreme fiscal conservatism in the Republican Party, there are currently 12 balanced budget amendments in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate there are three. I had my staff double-check that for me. Twelve balanced budget amendments in the House. They are all basically the same. Some have even been offered by Members of my own party. I understand these Members' frustrations. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to pass my nine amendments to the Constitution for 10 years now, and my amendments are based on FDR's second bill of rights, which he proposed back in 1944. Today, 67 years later, here we are.

Mr. Speaker, I fundamentally believe that conservatives in Congress are pushing for this amendment, not to force a vote in Congress, but to rally States to act. Mr. Speaker, we have a troubling national debt and deficit, but the balanced budget amendment is not the solution.

The argument proponents of a balanced budget amendment make is as follows: Like families, businesses, and States, the Federal Government should balance its budget. But since it does not, we need a constitutional amendment to guarantee that it will do so.

Nearly every State in this Union has some form of a balanced budget requirement, but those States are not out of debt. Their amendments have restricted the ability of those States to care for their citizens in time of austerity or emergency, but their budgets are not balanced.

According to a Forbes analysis of the global debt crisis in January of 2010, every single State in the country is carrying some form of debt. These debts range from as little as \$17 per capita in Nebraska to \$4,490 in Connecticut. How can this be, Mr. Speaker? It's because the infrastructure of these States allows them to hide debt in capital funds. The Federal Government cannot, and I would argue the Federal Government should not follow this path. Congress should never seek to hide the fiscal realities from the public that bears the burden of the costs nor should we sell the public magic beans that a balanced budget amendment will somehow make the national debt and other problems go away.

Debt will exist just as new problems will arise. Just as there are new threats to America, unforeseen threats, just as there are future economic calamities that we cannot see, the Federal Government must play some role in addressing a national crisis. A balanced budget amendment would simply prohibit the Federal Government from exercising precisely the authority that it needs to exercise on behalf of the American people.

In fiscal year 2012, approximately 44 States will face revenue shortfalls. Many are desperately looking for ways to declare their State bankrupt. Bankrupt. I say it again, Mr. Speaker, because this proposed amendment would

place the Federal Government in a similar predicament. The effect on many States is calamitous. For instance, in Rhode Island, judges and court workers have cut pay and left 53 positions unfilled. This is still not enough to balance their budgets. As a desperate last resort, the chief justice has begun to dispose of cases on backlog, literally tossing them out. Florida is in the same predicament.

Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget amendment would force the Federal Government to deny Americans the right to seek redress and justice in Federal courts for the sake of balancing their budgets. In my home State of Illinois, mental health services have been cut by \$91 million. Human service directors are fearful that these cuts will cause a real public health and public safety crisis. Iowa, Idaho, Alabama, and Ohio are considering drastic cuts to education.

My colleagues across the aisle are so concerned about handing our children and grandchildren any amount of national debt that they fail to realize we are setting future generations up for failure. States are already cutting too many services that the American people and the American workforce need in order to remain strong and competitive. Should the Federal Government do the same, our legacy will be an America that is uneducated, ill-equipped to compete on a global level.

Mr. Speaker, as exemplified by its effects on the States, this amendment may sound good on its face, but it falls flat when examined more critically. Like an optical illusion, the image of which carries and changes as you draw closer, the balanced budget amendment masquerades as the savior of our budget; yet in reality it threatens to permanently destroy it.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Citizens for Tax Justice, and others, a Federal balanced budget amendment would do five very damaging things. It would damage our economy by making recessions deeper and more frequent. It would heighten the risk of default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. It would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future. It would favor wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it far more difficult to raise revenues on people who can afford to pay, and easier to cut programs for people who need them most. And lastly, Mr. Speaker, it would weaken the principle of majority rule. Therefore, passing a balanced budget amendment is not prudent. It's not the right path for our Nation to follow.

So let's return for a few moments to the five faults outlined by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Citizens for Tax Justice. These arguments will bring to light the dangers with which a balanced budget amendment would threaten our Nation.

The first fault. A balanced budget amendment would damage the econ-

omy and make recessions deeper and more frequent. Under a balanced budget amendment, Congress would be forced to adopt a rigid fiscal policy, not just under the amendment, but also under the Ryan budget, requiring the budget to be balanced or in surplus every year, regardless of the current economic situation or threat to our Nation's security.

A sluggish economy, with less revenue and more outgoing expenditures, creates a deficit, as we've seen from recent events. A deficit necessitates economic stimulation to reverse negative growth. That is why in the last session of Congress the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act invested in roads, bridges, mass transit, and other infrastructure, provided 95 percent of working Americans with an immediate tax cut, and extended unemployment insurance and COBRA for Americans hurt by the economic downturn through no fault of their own.

If Congress were forced to function under a balanced budget amendment, deficit reduction would be mandated, even more so during periods of slow or stalled economic growth, which is the opposite of what is needed in such a situation. This consistently proposed constitutional amendment risks making recessions more common and more catastrophic for middle class families, seniors, veterans, and the poor. Under such an amendment, Congress is stripped of any power to adequately respond.

The second fault. A balanced budget amendment would risk default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government while simultaneously challenging the separation of powers. A balanced budget amendment would bar the government from borrowing funds unless a three-fifths vote in both Houses of Congress permitted a raise in the debt limit. Under such a scenario, a budget crisis in which a default becomes a threat is more likely because of the limits placed on the fluidity of the debt ceiling. We are about to enter into a national conversation about what to do about the debt ceiling. That default under such a scenario becomes more likely to occur.

After a default of only a few days, the long-term impacts would quickly appear. Confidence in the ability of the U.S. to meet binding financial obligations would erode almost immediately. The government pays relatively low interest rates on its loans because it pays its debts back in full and on time. A default would mimic an earthquake, shaking confidence in the United States on a global scale, resulting in exploding interest rates and aftershocks felt in our national economy.

□ 1500

The international economy would also succumb to the rumblings of this potential disaster, and our deep connection to it would cause even further chaos here at home.

Other balanced budget proponents argue that since States have to balance

their budgets, so should the Federal Government. Indeed, many States are required to balance their operating budgets but not their total budgets. No such distinction is made by a balanced budget amendment.

Rainy day, or reserve funds, which States can draw on to balance their budgets, are prohibited by a BBA. Many States operating under a BBA require the Governors to submit a balanced budget, but do not require the actual achievement of it. Some States allow Governors to act unilaterally to cut spending in the middle of the fiscal year. This condition of the BBA would violate the Federal Constitution's separation of powers.

The Founding Fathers were deliberate in their construction of our government, and the separation of powers serves as a cornerstone in our democracy. Each branch has certain powers and limitations. Congress, the courts, and the President worked together but in distinct ways to move America forward. The threat of judicial involvement in matters of the budget is a real problem under the balanced budget amendment. The BBA would weaken the balance of power. It diminishes the authority of Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, to have the final say on taxes and spending.

Mr. Speaker, what purpose does this body serve if this amendment passes? Should we broaden the scope of judicial review granted to our Federal courts? By subverting the balance of power between the branches, this body steps onto a slippery slope of reassigning authority and moving away from the values inherent in our Constitution.

The third fault. A balanced budget amendment would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future.

Since the 1930s, our Nation has consistently made public investments that improve long-term productivity growth in education, in infrastructure, in research and development. All of the Federal highways in this country are paid for by this Congress. They have helped build a more perfect union between the States, within States.

When we take off from O'Hare airport in Chicago or from Reagan airport, all of the airports are Federal facilities run by the Federal Aviation Administration. When you visit your Nation's Capital and you take off from an airport, because airports function under the rigid guidelines of the FAA, there is a reasonable assurance, when your plane takes off from one airport and lands at another airport, that the length of the runway that you take off from and land on are reasonably the same. States don't determine the lengths of runways.

If we are going to build a national government, if we are going to build one country, if we are going to form a more perfect union, only the Federal Government has the power to do that. It simply cannot be done one State at a time. In a global economy and in a global economic environment, we must

move as one Nation to challenge Europe, to challenge the Japanese, to challenge the Chinese, to challenge cheap labor and cheap labor markets abroad.

We must have one national standard, not 50 individual State sovereign standards to move our Nation—our education system, our infrastructure and our research and development—forward. These efforts encourage increased private sector investment, leading to a surplus and a thriving economy.

A balanced budget amendment, which requires a balanced budget each and every year, would limit the government's ability to make public investments, thereby hindering our future growth and thereby hindering our ability as a Nation to be competitive nationally and internationally—a very important point, Mr. Speaker, for which I want to deviate from my prepared remarks.

You see, it is just simply impossible to go one State at a time or to assume that the private sector, acting on its own, has the capacity to address the question of sustained full production and full employment on their own. President Truman made it perfectly clear: All of the policies of the Federal Government must be geared to the objective of sustained, full production and full employment, to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment. In the 112th Congress, unemployment is at 9 percent, and not a single piece of legislation considered by the 112th Congress has done anything to address 13 million unemployed Americans.

A few short weeks ago, I came to the House floor after having purchased an iPad, and I said that I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that at some point in time this new device, which is now probably responsible for eliminating thousands of American jobs—now Borders is closing stores, because why do you need to go to Borders anymore? Why do you need to go to Barnes & Noble? Buy an iPad and download your book, download your newspaper, download your magazine.

At Chicago State University in my congressional district, in the freshman class, they are not being given textbooks any longer. They are all being given iPads as they enter school. President Wayne Watson hopes to have a textbook-less campus within 4 years where at this State university they no longer have textbooks.

Well, what becomes of publishing companies and publishing company jobs? What becomes of bookstores and librarians and all of the jobs associated with paper?

Well, in the not-too-distant future, such jobs simply will not exist. Steve Jobs is doing pretty well. He created the iPad. Certainly it has made life more efficient for Americans, but the iPad is produced in China. It's not produced here in the United States. So the Chinese get to take advantage of our

First Amendment value, that is, to provide freedom of speech through the iPad to the American people, but there is no protection for jobs here in America to ensure that the American people are being put to work.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress and the direction of this Congress, in its obsession with debts and deficits, is heading in the opposite direction of sustained full production. Again, iPads are made in China, and full employment. There are 13 million unemployed Americans counting on this Congress to do something.

They certainly can't count on the State of Illinois; it's broke. They can't count on the State of Idaho; it's broke. They can't count on the State of Alabama; the State of Alabama is broke. They can't count on Mississippi; Mississippi is broke. Louisiana is broke. The States are broke.

So the Federal Government is under an obligation to sustain full production and full employment to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment in the United States, not in China.

The third fault of the BBA would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future. Since the 1930s, our Nation has consistently made public investments that have improved long-term productivity growth in education, in infrastructure, and in research and development.

These efforts encourage increased private sector investment, leading to a budget surplus and a thriving economy. A balanced budget amendment, which requires a balanced budget each and every year, would limit the government's ability to make public investments, thereby hindering future growth.

For years, conservatives have abused the debt and the deficit as a springboard from which to argue for smaller government and cuts to programs that serve as social safety nets for American families. Although we must consider the debt and the deficit, the larger and more significant issue is the nature of the debt that we create.

If you invest \$50,000 in a business, in a house or in your education, you can expect future returns on your investment. If you "invest" the same \$50,000 in a gun collection or ammunition, what are the future investment returns? Both investments result in \$50,000 of debt, but only one results in returns that can transform that debt into long-term gain. Social investments provide the potential for greater returns in the long run in the same fashion as personal investments. Even small expenditures on social programs lay a foundation for great wealth in the long term.

If the Nation chooses to invest \$1.5 trillion over a 5-year period in the building of bridges and roads and airports and railroads and mass transit and schools and housing and health care, we could create some debt.

□ 1510

But the increased ability of companies to interact and to ship their goods over well-paved and planned roads, the new businesses that would sprout around the freshly built or newly expanded airport, the higher wages of a student who is well-educated and able to attend college, resulting in more tax revenue, and the improved productivity of employees at their healthiest would eventually result in greater returns for our country.

The extension of the Bush-era tax cuts for corporations and the rich brought about some short-term stimulus of consumer spending. But similar to Reagan's tax cuts, which resulted in record government deficits, the long-term damage outweighs the immediate effects. Reagan's tax cuts for the rich came at the expense of investing in our Nation's need for long-term balanced economic growth. The Reagan administration neglected and cut back on our Nation's investment in infrastructure, education, health care, housing, job training, transportation, energy conservation, and much more.

The inclination of most conservatives in both parties is to cut the debt by cutting programs for the most vulnerable among us—our poor, our children, our elderly, and our minorities. This approach, however, has been proven false too many times. A balanced budget amendment would take us back to this archaic and ineffective system permanently.

The fourth fault. A balanced budget amendment favors wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it harder to raise revenues and easier to cut programs.

Again, a BBA ultimately favors wealthier Americans over middle- and lower-income Americans. Under current law, legislation can pass by a majority of those present and voting by a recorded vote. The BBA requires, however, that legislation that raises taxes be approved on a rollcall vote by a majority of the full membership of both Houses. Thus, the BBA would make it harder to cut the deficit by curbing special interest tax breaks of the oil and gas industries, and it would make it easier to reduce programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, veterans' benefits, education, environmental programs, and assistance for poor children. Wealthy individuals and corporations receive most of their government benefits in the form of tax entitlements while low-income and middle-income Americans receive most of their government benefits through programs.

As evidenced by the cuts that both parties agreed upon recently, it is far easier to cut social welfare programs than to cut spending for our military or to increase taxes. As long as spending is a political issue, cuts to those programs that assist those with the smallest voice in our government will always happen first.

Raising taxes, the only option to address a budget deficit aside from cutting programs, is already a burdensome

political issue. The additional requirements of a BBA further complicate the process of raising taxes. This means that the richest Americans will likely keep the benefits they receive from our government via tax cuts. Meanwhile, the poor lose the programs that provide them with housing, with food, with job training, with health care, and the very means to survive. This will further reinforce the growing gap between the rich and the rest of our society, middle class, working poor, and the destitute alike.

Aside from this already distressing point, when the baby boom generation retires, Mr. Speaker, the ratio of workers to retirees will fall to very low levels. This poses difficulties for Social Security since Social Security has been a pure pay-as-you-go system, with the payroll taxes of current workers paying for the benefits of current retirees. This was acceptable as long as today's workers could pay for today's retirees. But in the future, when there are fewer workers to pay for more retirees, the system is going to be out of balance.

So in 1977 and 1983, the Social Security Administration took important and prudent steps towards addressing this issue. It allowed the accumulation of reserves to be used later when needed. These changes were akin to what families do by saving for retirement during their working years and then by drawing down on their savings after they reach retirement. The balanced budget amendment insists that total government expenditures in any year, including those for Social Security benefits, not exceed total revenues collected in that same year, including revenues from Social Security payroll taxes. Thus, the benefits of the baby boomers would have to be financed in full by the taxes of those working and paying into the system then. This undercuts the central reforms of 1983. Drawing down on any part of accumulated reserves under a BBA, required under present law, means that the trust funds were spending more in benefits in those years than they were receiving in taxes. Under a BBA, that would be impermissible deficit spending.

The fifth fault. A BBA weakens the principle of majority rule and makes balancing the budget more difficult.

Most balanced budgets require that unless three-fifths of the Members of Congress agree to raising the debt ceiling, the budget must be balanced at all times. They also require that legislation raising taxes must be approved on a rollcall vote by a majority of the full membership of both Houses, not just those present and voting.

Currently, this provision weakens the principle of majority rule, and that's exactly what the tea party and my conservative colleagues want. Why do they want it? Because a three-fifths requirement empowers a minority, 40 percent plus one, in any given year. It creates a small group of people willing to threaten economic turmoil and disruption unless they get their way, i.e.,

the Republican freshmen, with the ability to extort concessions or exercise unprecedented leverage over our national economic and fiscal policy. Mr. Speaker, haven't the last few weeks demonstrated how difficult it already is to reach a compromise on a budget? This provision will simply make it impossible.

The final argument, Mr. Speaker, is what I'm calling the Ezra Klein argument. There is a final fault which is not on my list, but it is significant enough to mention. Ezra Klein of The Washington Post cleverly points out in a recent article, entitled "The Worst Idea in Washington," that under a balanced budget amendment, not a single budget of the Bush or Reagan administration would have qualified as constitutional. In fact, the only recent administration which would not violate the requirements of a balanced budget amendment would have been President Clinton's, and that would have been for only two of his budgets. Mr. Speaker, if President Reagan's budgets wouldn't qualify, is this something we should even be considering in this Congress? I don't think so.

I have listed a few, and certainly not an exhaustive list, of the arguments against the balanced budget amendment. The truth is the Federal budget is quite unlike fiscal practices of businesses, families, and States even though we keep hearing the argument: The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like I do at home. The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like our families do. The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like the States do. But contrary to popular myth, except in times of war and recession, the country has a conservative record of keeping deficits actually in line. It's when the States fail, it's when there are wars that we are fighting, and it's when we are looking at unforeseen economic calamity that we need a Federal Government that can reach into the deep recesses of her bounty to bring about a more perfect Union and keep the Nation moving forward. Without the Federal Government, the States cannot do it on their own, and the private sector has shown a reluctance to do it without regulation from the Federal Government to make the Union more perfect.

Let me add one final quote, Mr. Speaker. In 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., stood not very far from this auspicious location and delivered a speech at the feet of Abraham Lincoln, at the feet of Abraham Lincoln's memorial at the end of our Mall. He began by saying, today I stand in the shadow of a man who 100 years ago set the slave free. But 100 years later, they find themselves still trapped and still isolated in the ghettos and the barrios and the rural areas of our Nation. He said, Mr. Speaker, today we have come here, in a sense, to cash a check. Now imagine that. Martin Luther King, Jr., at the other end of this Mall, is looking in the direction of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress of the United

States. And he says, Mr. Speaker, we've come here to cash a check, a check that should give us upon demand the riches of security and of freedom and justice. But America, Dr. King says, has issued us a bounced check. It keeps coming back marked "insufficient funds." But I refuse to believe that there are no funds in the great vault of opportunity of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am 46 years old, and I've had the privilege of serving in this Congress for nearly 16 years. I remember on September 10, 2001 when we stood here on the floor of this Congress, my dear colleagues, and this Congress declared that it was broke, that it couldn't find money for anything. We took a vote on September 10, 2001, to defund education programs for the most vulnerable children in our Nation.

□ 1520

Every Member of Congress, mostly from conservatives, and many conservative Democrats, came and made the argument that we could no longer afford to provide high-quality education for your children, that we could no longer afford to provide health care for all of the American people, that we could no longer afford it. And just 24 hours later, the tragedy, the great tragedy of the 20th century, terrorists attacked the World Trade Center and flew a plane into the ground in Pennsylvania and landed a plane on our Nation's defense system at the Pentagon. Just 24 hours later, the Congress of the United States that did not have the money to provide for education for our children, the Congress of the United States that did not have the money to provide health care for all of the American people, suddenly it found an unlimited amount of money to chase down Saddam Hussein. And we are spending an unlimited amount of money, just 24 hours later, to find Osama bin Laden in a cave in Afghanistan. Ten years later, we haven't found him yet. Yet we continue to spend billions and billions and billions of dollars.

So on one day the government is broke. Twenty-four hours later, Dr. King says the Nation has issued us a promissory note, and it keeps coming back marked "insufficient funds" for priorities that matter to the American people.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, needs the flexibility to respond in times of economic downturn or in war in a way that businesses, that families, and that States never have to consider.

I have been in the House long enough to know now that when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came into the majority with large deficits and debt, I knew their first response would be to cut social spending, to weaken government regulation and underfund protection of workers' rights and civil rights and environmental protections. You name it.

I wish I could say I didn't see this coming, but conservative politicians

want to get government off the backs of finance, off the backs of finance and industry. They are willing and ready to use the current economic situation to do it, and they intend to place the burden on the backs of the middle class, of seniors, of children, of veterans and the poor.

The Republican budget that we voted on today does just that. The balanced budget amendment aims to make it a permanent fixture.

Mr. Speaker, I know we can do better. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of middle class Americans. We need to achieve the America of everyone's dreams. The burden of that dream must rest squarely on the shoulders of every American that can carry it.

I find it offensive that some of the most profitable corporations in this country pay no taxes and some even get a refund. I find it offensive that the richest 400 people in this country who have more wealth than half of all Americans combined have an effective tax rate of only 16.6 percent.

In the words of William Jennings Bryan: "When I find a man who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours."

With those wise words, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of the Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 1975 note), the order of the House of January 5, 2011, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Commission on Civil Rights for a term expiring December 15, 2016:

Mr. Michael Yaki, San Francisco, California.

The Chair announces that the term of appointment of Mr. Todd Gaziano to the Commission on Civil Rights expires on December 15, 2013.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 216. An act to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and intentional violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; 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.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill

of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUNYON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 43, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1285. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Honey Producer Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Order; Termination of Referendum Procedures [Document Number: AMS-FV-07-0091; FV-07-706-FR] (RIN: 0581-AC78) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1286. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Amendment to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Livestock) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-10-0051; NOP-10-04FR] (RIN: 0581-AD04) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1287. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0060; FV10-984-1FIR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1288. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2010-2011 Marketing Year [Docket Nos.: AMS-FV-09-0082; FV10-985-1A IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1289. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Country of Origin Labeling of Packed Honey [Document No.: AMS-FV-08-0075] (RIN: 0581-AC89) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1290. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Section 610 Review [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0006] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1291. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Avocados Grown

in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0067; FV10-915-1FR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1292. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2010-2011 Crop Year for Tart Cherries [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-930-4FR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1293. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1294. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 4-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the Kingdom of Sweden; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1295. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to section 527(f) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236), a report listing outstanding expropriation cases; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1296. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-028, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1297. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-013, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1298. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-141, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1299. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's fiscal year 2010 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1300. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission United States and Mexico, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1301. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2010, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1302. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's

annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1303. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA245) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1304. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ90) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1305. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ89) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE XII

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 358. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 20, 2011.

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to employers for the value of the service not performed during the period employees are performing service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. SMITH

of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. POSEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WEST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MICA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1571. A bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs; referred to the Committee

on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to improve safety at manned offshore installations, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1573. A bill to facilitate implementation of title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, promote regulatory coordination, and avoid market disruption; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, concerning length and weight limitations for vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1575. A bill to make certain individuals ineligible for visas or admission to the United States and to revoke visas and other entry documents previously issued to such individuals, and to impose certain financial measures on such individuals, until the Russian Federation has thoroughly investigated the death of Sergei Leonidovich Magnitsky and brought the Russian criminal justice system into compliance with international legal standards, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize advance appropriations for military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense, generally title I of the annual Department of Defense appropriations Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1578. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health

care system's assessment and response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1579. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KIND, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SHULER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 1580. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1581. A bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued management as de facto wilderness areas and to release inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System that are not recommended for wilderness designation from the land use restrictions of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Final Rule and the 2005 State Petitions for Inventoried Roadless Area Management Final Rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1582. A bill to address the application of the national primary ambient air quality standard for ozone with respect to extreme nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury provide a Tax Receipt to each taxpayer who files a Federal income tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt maintenance activities from certain analysis requirements; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1585. A bill to allow States to elect to receive contributions to the Highway Trust Fund in lieu of participating in the Federal-aid highway program or certain public transportation programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, concerning approval of applications for the airport security screening opt-out program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to modification of certain mortgages on principal residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANSECO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BACA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of voluntary advance care planning consultation under Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 1590. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Space Shuttle Discovery upon retirement; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1591. A bill to guarantee that military funerals are conducted with dignity and respect; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1592. A bill to limit United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority if the Palestinian Authority unilaterally declares a Palestinian state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an unlimited exclusion from transfer taxes for certain farmland and land of conservation value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that installment sales treatment shall not fail to apply to property acquired for conservation purposes by a State or local government or certain tax-exempt organizations merely because purchase funds are held in a sinking or similar fund pursuant to State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make all veterans eligible for home loans under the veterans mortgage revenue bond program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1596. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the purposes for which they were collected, to ensure adequate resources for the cleanup of hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, 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 Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1597. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to promote energy independence and self-sufficiency by providing for the use of net metering by certain small electric energy generation systems, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1599. A bill to facilitate economic growth and development in Indian country, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, Financial Services, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1600. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to take actions to ensure that not fewer than 2 air traffic controllers are on duty and physically situated within the air traffic control room or tower of certain airports at all times during periods of airfield operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend certain expiring provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend title 31 of the United States Code to require that Federal children's programs be separately displayed and analyzed in the President's budget; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1603. A bill to establish the Emergency Trade Deficit Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 1604. A bill to facilitate certain activities, alleviate the extra regulatory burdens, and reduce costs related to carrying out projects of the Central Valley Project, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1605. A bill to reduce Federal spending in a responsible manner; referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide oral health services to aged, blind, or disabled individuals under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend the suspension of the limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1608. A bill to include the county of Mohave, in the State of Arizona, as an affected area for purposes of making claims under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act based on exposure to atmospheric nuclear testing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend the War Powers Resolution to limit the use of funds for introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in ad-

dition to the Committee on Rules, 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. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1610. A bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of Clean Energy Business Zones and for tax incentives for the construction of, and employment at, energy-efficient buildings and clean energy facilities, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1612. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a commission on urotrauma; referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. HECK (for himself, Mr. MATHE-SON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend title VI of the Clean Air Act to make a restriction on the use of class II substances inapplicable to certain fire suppression agents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1614. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat amounts paid for umbilical cord blood banking services as medical care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1615. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Gallium metal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1616. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to integrate public libraries into State and local workforce investment boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLON, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 1617. A bill to strengthen communities through English literacy and civics

education for new Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1618. A bill to require the filing of certain information regarding a residential mortgage in any proceeding for foreclosure of the mortgage; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, to require commemorative works in the District of Columbia and its environs to be constructed of materials that are grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1620. A bill to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, environmental protection, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property and identifying inaccurate, duplicate, and out-of-date Federal land inventories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. JONES, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 1621. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Centennial of Marine Corps Aviation, and to support construction of the Marine Corps Heritage Center; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1622. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for voluntary incentive auction revenue sharing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. STARK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1623. A bill to reauthorize the Assets for Independence Act, to provide for the approval of applications to operate new demonstration programs and to renew existing programs, to enhance program flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. INS-LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish uniform national standards for the interconnection of certain small power production facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1625. A bill to prohibit funding for the Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr.

PAUL, Mr. COBLE, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to limit the printing of the Congressional Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements for the placement of monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a retail tax on disposable carryout bags, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ISSA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 1630. A bill to establish a procedure to safeguard the surpluses of the Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds; referred to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for adjustments in the individual income tax rates to reflect regional differences in the cost-of-living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1632. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the "Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. HURT, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 1633. A bill to establish a temporary prohibition against revising any national ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter, to limit Federal regulation of nuisance dust in areas in which such dust is regulated under State, tribal, or local law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for investments lost in a fraudulent Ponzi-type scheme; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1636. A bill to establish expanded learning time initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1637. A bill to safeguard the Crime Victims Fund; referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, 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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1638. A bill to stimulate the economy, provide for a sound United States dollar by defining a value for the dollar, to remove the authority of Federal Reserve banks to pay earnings on certain balances maintained at such banks, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, 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. POSEY (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1641. A bill to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to plan

to return to the Moon and develop a sustained human presence on the Moon; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. CHU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1642. A bill to prevent the illegal sale of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RIVERA:

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend section 412(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the provision of cash assistance or medical assistance to any refugee who, after entering the United States, travels to a country that supports international terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1645. A bill to construct a specialty hospital and toxins research center on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to preserve jobs and coastal communities through transparency and accountability in fishery management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1647. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which certain veterans may submit claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary to any regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON,

Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1650. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to create a designation for property owners who take actions to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff into the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to make modifications to the Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the dollar amount requirements for articles and merchandise under the administrative exemptions and entry under regulations provisions of that Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for additional opportunities to enroll under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1655. A bill to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by imposing additional economic sanctions against Iran, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to urban Medicare-dependent hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 1657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the enforcement penalties for misrepresentation of a business

concern as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1658. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs telehealth clinic in Craig, Colorado, as the "Major William Edward Adams Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and to allow the credit for certain off-highway vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act, to adjust dollar limits on check hold policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow loans from certain retirement plans for the payment of certain small business expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1662. A bill to encourage financial institutions to meet the needs of borrowers in low- to moderate-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEST (for himself, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily provide the work opportunity tax credit for small businesses hiring unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modernize and enhance the Federal Government's response to oil spills, to improve oversight and regulation of offshore drilling, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution calling for an independent international investigation of the April 10, 2010, plane crash that killed President of Poland Lech Kaczynski and 95 other individuals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H. Con. Res. 45. A concurrent resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving in, or have served in, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn; referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in

addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. JONES (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 229. A resolution honoring the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Operations at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, for its service in providing dignified transfer of our Nation's fallen heroes to their families and loved ones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 230. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the House may not consider any reported bill until at least 72 hours after it is reported; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 231. A resolution urging that the United States, the Government of Iraq, and other responsible actors ensure that humanitarian protections are upheld for the residents of Camp Ashraf in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 232. A resolution recognizing the recent admission by Richard Goldstone of the deeply-flawed conclusions in his report to the United Nations Human Rights Council and urging the Administration to take steps to reverse the damage done by the Goldstone Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 233. A resolution welcoming the new state of Southern Sudan, encouraging Sudan and Southern Sudan to resolve separation issues and the future of the Abyei region, and urging the Governments of Sudan and Southern Sudan to abide by the principles of peace, democracy, and human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mr. KISSELL, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H. Res. 234. A resolution recognizing the importance of breast cancer early detection efforts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Res. 235. A resolution recognizing April 23 as National Sovereignty and Children's Day in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois introduced a bill (H.R. 1665) for the relief of Ewa Mozdzen, Jaroslaw Mozdzen, and Sylwia Mozdzen; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution reads, "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. . . ."

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 1572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1573.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 & 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes,

Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 relating to the power of Congress to "dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment of the Constitution:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 & Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, 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 of Officer thereof.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, sec. 8, cl.4 (the Bankruptcy Clause), and Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.R. 1588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution, as well as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution states that all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . ." (Sixteenth Amendment). This legislation, which relates to income taxes, modifies the income tax code enacted by Congress pursuant to this constitutional authority.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . ." (Sixteenth Amendment). This legislation, which relates to income taxes, modifies the income tax code enacted by Congress pursuant to this constitutional authority.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . ." (Sixteenth Amendment).

By Mrs. CAPPAS:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution to regulate Commerce with foreign

Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade amongst the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to treaties lawfully entered into and ratified pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS 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.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clauses 1 and 18 and Article 1 Section 9 Clause 7.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 1603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the constitution.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—Power to Regulate Commerce

“The power to regulate commerce is the power to prescribe conditions and rules for the carrying-on of commercial transactions, the keeping-free of channels of commerce, the regulating of prices and terms of sale.”

“If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of congress, though limited to specified objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, is vested in congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of the power as are found in the constitution of the United States.”

Gibbons v. Ogden, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1, 196-197 (1824).

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: “The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, and 18.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

The Congress shall have Power to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer term than two Years;

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 1613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I; and

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power “[t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . throughout the United States.”

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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. KIND:

H.R. 1620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article Section 8.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 5 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states, “The Congress shall have the Power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof and of foreign Coin . . .”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1623.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Each House may determine the Rules of it Proceedings.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution reserves to Congress the power to raise and support Armies and provide and maintain a Navy, as well as make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides that the Congress shall have Power:

“To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;”

“To regulate Commerce . . . among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;” and

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7. No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 1 "Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . . ."

Art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 18 Necessary and proper clause.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause I.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RIVERA:

H.R. 1644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Interstate Travel Regulation of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 1645.

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. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 1653.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 7 and Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 1655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 1657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (to make rules for the regulation of land)

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ."), and the 16th Amendment.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 1663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and excises to, pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 5: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 23: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 24: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 58: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
- H.R. 59: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 64: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. NEAL.
- H.R. 65: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 100: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mrs. BLACK.
- H.R. 112: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 114: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 154: Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 177: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
- H.R. 178: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 181: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 190: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 210: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 287: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 289: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 303: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 320: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H.R. 321: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 329: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 361: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 365: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 374: Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 412: Mrs. BIGGERT.
- H.R. 420: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BILBRAY.
- H.R. 426: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 432: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 436: Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
- H.R. 452: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LANCE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
- H.R. 458: Ms. HANABUSA.
- H.R. 459: Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. GUINTA.
- H.R. 466: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DOLD, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SIREN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 517: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 527: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 558: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
- H.R. 567: Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 591: Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 594: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 605: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DOLD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SCHOCK.
- H.R. 614: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 615: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 616: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 640: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 645: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. DINGELL.
- H.R. 664: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 672: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. NUGENT.
- H.R. 674: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 695: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 709: Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 718: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 719: Mr. COLE and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H.R. 721: Mr. WOMACK.
- H.R. 750: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H.R. 757: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 763: Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 787: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 800: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 822: Mr. BACA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. DINGELL.
- H.R. 827: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 831: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 835: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 849: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 870: Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 879: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 883: Mr. LUJÁN and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.
- H.R. 909: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 938: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 942: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 948: Mr. HEINRICH.
- H.R. 960: Mr. LONG and Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 965: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. MALONEY.
- H.R. 984: Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 985: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 1004: Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 1012: Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 1027: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HALL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1041: Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MATHESON.
- H.R. 1063: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 1065: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1082: Mr. GARRETT.
- H.R. 1089: Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 1090: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 1091: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1092: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1112: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 1123: Ms. BASS of California.
- H.R. 1133: Mr. BENISHEK.
- H.R. 1134: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 1138: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 1161: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1167: Mr. GUINTA and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H.R. 1181: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1182: Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 1187: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1190: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 1195: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1206: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 1214: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 1218: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CRITZ.
- H.R. 1219: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 1229: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. CASSIDY.
- H.R. 1230: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. CASSIDY.
- H.R. 1231: Mr. PAUL and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
- H.R. 1234: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1236: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. LANCE.
- H.R. 1240: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 1249: Mr. GALLEGLY.
- H.R. 1259: Mr. POSEY, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 1265: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1281: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 1285: Mr. NUGENT.
- H.R. 1286: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1287: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1288: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 1299: Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 1309: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1310: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 1322: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 1323: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1327: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAUL, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 1332: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 1337: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 1340: Ms. BUERKLE.
- H.R. 1341: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 1342: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DOLD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 1351: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 1375: Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 1377: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 1380: Mr. PAUL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 1390: Mr. KELLY and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1391: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1397: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1404: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1416: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1417: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1418: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1425: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1426: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1427: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1433: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1440: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1449: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1463: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1482: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1497: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1506: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1508: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1510: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 1517: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1520: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1527: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1533: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1536: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1537: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1539: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1546: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1547: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1551: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1558: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. DUFFY.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. HUNTER.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 25: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H. Res. 47: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Res. 86: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 98: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. REHBERG.

H. Res. 111: Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 134: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H. Res. 137: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 180: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 184: Mr. PEARCE and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 187: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 211: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 222: Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 225: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 227: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. NEAL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1081: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING FATHER DAN
COUGHLIN

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement on behalf of Albert Caswell, in honor of Father Dan Coughlin.

A MAN OF GRACE

A
A man . . .
A man of grace . . .
Our Lord, upon this place . . .
Had so placed . . .
As a true reflection of his face . . .
All in this temple of democracy's faith . . .
This shrine our forefathers had so
embraced . . .
For America was founded on such faith . . .
For no other experiment has since so been
raised . . .
For Father Dan, you were a pioneer . . .
As America's first Catholic Chaplin so
here . . .
To so spread the word, upon each and every
morning heard . . .
To counsel and to inspire . . .
Lifting hearts higher . . .
All for our nation's leaders, you never
tired . . .
As an instrument of our Lord's heart . . .
Oh how your faith, has so done its part . . .
To bring a Congress through such storms and
the dark . . .
All but with, the light of your fine heart . . .
And our Lord's word, casting out the
dark . . .
And Father we will miss your kind warm
face . . .
And your inspiring call to God, on each new
day . . .
And your warm heart, filled with such
grace . . .
Forever, in our hearts you shall hold a
place . . .
For your blessings bestowed upon us all . . .
Answering our Lord's, call to faith . . .
For such people, Heaven so holds a place . . .
For such men of grace . . .
In honor of Father Dan, and all of the
hearts you have touched over the years . . .
Bless you—Albert Carey Caswell.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF BELL
GARDENS ON THE OCCASION OF
THE CITY'S 50TH YEAR ANNIVER-
SARY CELEBRATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Bell Gardens and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating its 42,000 residents on the city's 50th Anniversary. I am proud to represent this

growing city—aptly characterized by its motto "A City that Works"—as part of my 34th Congressional District of California.

While we honor the city's 50 years of official incorporation, its intriguing history dates back to the late 18th century when a Spanish soldier, Antonio Lugo, received a land grant that included the present-day Bell Gardens. Today's residents need only stroll down to 7000 Gage Avenue to admire one of Lugo's homes. Built about 1810, Casa de San Antonio, also known as the Gage Mansion, is California Historical Landmark number 984 and holds claim to being the oldest standing building in Los Angeles County.

The "Gage" Mansion is named after another notable Bell Gardens resident. A lawyer who married one of Lugo's great, great granddaughters, Henry T. Gage served as California's 29th Governor from 1898–1903. After Gage acquired and occupied the mansion, he worked extensively to restore the Los Angeles farmhouse and its magnificent early architectural designs.

Boasting some of the richest agricultural land in the country, Bell Gardens remained a farming community until the 1930s. During the Depression era, when farming became less profitable, the character of the community began to change as developers bought up the land to build affordable housing for struggling families.

During World War I and World War II, area defense plants spurred local growth and economic prosperity throughout the community. Attracted by the defense jobs, families moved to Bell Gardens, leading to the construction of new homes, more schools, and a prosperous business climate.

Today, Bell Gardens continues to be a dynamic and hardworking community. The city prides itself on its beautiful parks, emerald green soccer fields, childcare centers, a sparkling lake stocked with fish and waterfowl, and a community golf course.

The state-of-the-art renovation of John Anson Ford Park to include the Bell Gardens Sports Center is one of the city's crowning achievements. The multi-million-dollar facility is open to the community for soccer, baseball, tennis, golf and other sports. The city also entered into an agreement with the professional soccer organization Chivas Regal USA, which uses the complex as a practice facility.

The city's successful efforts to revitalize Downtown Bell Gardens is also a great source of pride for the community. Families now have many more retail and entertainment options. Completed in April 2004, Los Jardines Shopping Center replaced a blighted, underused commercial block with a vibrant, village-like, attractively landscaped shopping center that provides a pedestrian-friendly environment for the community. In addition, the shopping center houses nationally recognized merchants to serve the city's growing but largely underserved Latino community. Los Jardines is located within the city's bustling Central City Re-

development Project Area, adjacent to the popular Bicycle Casino, one of the most successful card clubs in Los Angeles County, the Marketplace shopping center, and the Village Square Shopping Center.

Affordable housing for the city's residents is also a priority. Housing communities ushered in by the city such as Las Casas de Bell Gardens, Clara Vista Housing Development, and the City of Bell Gardens Senior Housing and Community Center offer families and seniors affordable, comfortable and attractive units to call home. Addressing the need for additional affordable housing for seniors, the city developed Park View Terrace which provides 75 affordable units to seniors. The city is currently undertaking another affordable housing development project, Terra Bella Senior Housing Center, which is planned to start construction in the fall of 2011. It will provide 65 affordable units for seniors. These developments clearly represent the city's strong commitment to providing quality programs and services to the residents of the Bell Gardens community.

Mr. Speaker, as the city commemorates its 50th Anniversary with a free weekend celebration April 22–24 that includes carnival rides, food vendors, business booths, live entertainment and the Miss Bell Gardens Pageant, I ask my colleagues to please join me in commending this "city that works" on its historic milestone, and in extending our best wishes for many more years of progress ahead.

TED SMITH TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ted Smith, of Trinidad Colorado. Mr. Smith recently taught at the Trinidad State Junior College, where he established the now famous aquaculture program. He is moving on to the Native Aquatic Species Restoration Facility in Alamosa, Colorado, and will surely bring the same culture of excellence and success.

During his tenure with the Junior College, Mr. Smith mentored a number of students who have graduated to various wildlife jobs. Indeed, the Colorado Division of Wildlife currently employs many of his former students.

Mr. Smith's new job with the NASRF allows him to expand his oversight of Colorado aquatic life. The facility houses 14 endangered species and is one of the foremost organizations for aquatic research.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Ted Smith today. There is no doubt his success with Trinidad State Junior College will translate to the NASRF. His past and future contributions to Colorado's environmental research are immeasurable and he will continue his conservation efforts of wildlife across the state.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SEVERE WEATHER TRAGEDY IN
TUSHKA, OKLAHOMA**HON. DAN BOREN**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with a heavy heart.

Last night, powerful storms ripped through my district and the State of Oklahoma killing multiple people and causing millions of dollars in damage.

According to the National Weather Service, yesterday at 8:16 pm Oklahoma time, a tornado touched down near the town of Tushka, Oklahoma in Pushmataha County, killing at least two of my constituents and causing millions of dollars in damage.

This is a terrible tragedy.

Oklahomans are well aware of the threat they face every year from severe weather.

But this tragedy and these types of storms are never easy for anyone to bear.

In fact, the damage caused by yesterday's storm is very personal to me.

During my time representing eastern Oklahoma in the House of Representatives, I have visited the school in Tushka that has been destroyed by this storm.

Tushka is a small rural town in Southeastern Oklahoma.

A town much like many of the small communities each of us represent here in Congress.

The people of Tushka are a group of hard-working and resilient Oklahomans who will undoubtedly get through this tragedy.

But at this difficult moment, I want to pause and let the victims and families who are suffering because of these storms know that my wife Andrea and I are praying for them during this difficult hour.

RECOGNIZING ACCOMPLISHMENTS
OF GINA L. BLEAN AND KELLY
A. HEYSINGER**HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of Dubuque business owners Gina L. Blean and Kelly A. Heysinger for winning the Small Business Administration's (SBA's) Iowa "Small Business Person of the Year" award. Gina and Kelly are co-owners of Unified Therapy Services, Inc. in Dubuque, Iowa.

Small businesses are the driving force behind our economy and I couldn't be prouder of this one. This prestigious award is only bestowed upon the nation's top entrepreneurs—and I'm glad to see the entrepreneurial spirit flourishing in eastern Iowa. We must continue to promote our small businesses and make sure that they can thrive and create new jobs.

In May, the SBA will honor Gina, Kelly, and other winners from across the country in Washington, DC, during National Small Business Week. The SBA will also select the "National Small Business Person of the Year" from the state "Small Business Persons of the Year." I will be rooting for them to win this prestigious national award.

FIRST LEGACY COMMUNITY
CREDIT UNION**HON. MELVIN L. WATT**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a credit union located in my Congressional District, First Legacy Community Credit Union, on 70 years of service to its members. First Legacy, originally named School Workers Federal Credit Union, was founded in Charlotte, North Carolina, on February 14, 1941, by a group of educators in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System. At its beginning, First Legacy offered a simple savings and loan program; today, it offers a broad range of financial services to its members. First Legacy Community Credit Union's continued dedication to serving the community, as well as efforts to increase financial literacy in North Carolina, is worthy of special recognition. I commend the work that First Legacy Community Credit Union continues to do and wish this outstanding community credit union another 70 years of success.

HONORING GOODWILL INDUSTRIES
OF MID-MICHIGAN**HON. DALE E. KILDEE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan as they celebrate their 80th anniversary. A celebration will be held on April 29th in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, to commemorate this milestone.

In 1931 the Oak Park Methodist Church established an agency to assist people with disabilities and Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan was born. The agency's heart is centered on serving the needs of persons facing a variety of barriers, including physical and mental disabilities, illiteracy, substance abuse, inadequate education, ex-felons, and welfare dependency. Headquartered in Flint, the agency currently serves clients in ten Mid-Michigan counties. With their ultimate goal of placing individuals in productive employment, Goodwill Industries has several Workforce Development programs, a retail division, and an e-commerce program. As a private, non-profit 501(c)(3) charity, the agency remains focused on their clients' future.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Goodwill Industries of Mid-Michigan for 80 years of successfully serving the community. The ten Mid-Michigan counties served by Goodwill Industries have benefited from the work, dedication and enthusiasm of their clients, staff, volunteers and supporters. I wish them the best and hope they continue their success for many, many years.

REX THORNE TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rex Thorne of Huntington, Indiana. Mr. Thorne was a war hero, an incredibly successful engineer and community leader in a life that touched people all over the United States.

Following high school, Mr. Thorne enlisted in the U.S. Navy where he served on the USS *Heyliger* during World War II. Mr. Thorne's bravery and that of his fellow servicemen contributed to America's victory in the Pacific Theater.

After serving his country abroad, he returned to attend Purdue University. He graduated with a degree in chemical engineering and quickly joined the Union Camp paper company. During his tenure with the company, he advanced from working in the lab to his eventual position as Corporate Director for Environmental Affairs. His work took him across the country and gave others an opportunity to meet and work with him.

Mr. Thorne also lent much of his time to volunteer work for clubs, charities and non-profit organizations. He enjoyed fund raising and organizing events for many groups, most notably the Boy Scouts, the Safe Shelter Board and the Salvation Army. He was an active member of the Rotary Club Savannah West and the Skidaway Island United Methodist Church, where he taught Sunday School for several years.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the life of Rex Thorne. From his service in World War II, his life as a businessman and his volunteer work, he had a profound impact on many people. There is no doubt that his legacy will continue to inspire others.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF STEPHEN
PAVELKO ON HIS OFFER
OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND
THE UNITED STATES MILITARY
ACADEMY**HON. ROBERT E. LATTA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Stephen Pavelko of Perrysburg, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Stephen brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Perrysburg High School in Perrysburg, Ohio, Stephen earned honors in multiple fields of study, taking a number of advanced placement courses. Stephen was inducted into the National Honor Society, was involved in a number of athletic activities and held various leadership positions.

Throughout high school, Stephen participated in athletic activities, including football,

basketball and baseball. He earned a varsity letter in football. I am confident that Stephen will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Stephen Pavelko on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point where he will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experiences. I am positive that Stephen will excel during his career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the nation.

ADA LAUNCHES JOBS-SOCIAL SECURITY-MINIMUM WAGE CAMPAIGN

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans or Democratic Action has launched a Progressive agenda for jobs, rejuvenating the American economy, saving Social Security, and raising the minimum wage.

JOBS

Workers without jobs can't provide adequately for the basic needs of their families. The unemployment crisis is damaging families and contributing to a multitude of economic and social ills, including:

The highest poverty rate for working-age people between 18 and 64—12.9% in 2009—since 1965. Today, 43.6 million Americans are living in poverty, 19 million of whom are in deep poverty.

Workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own often cannot pay mortgages and rent, even when receiving unemployment benefits, which are not equivalent to wages lost. The foreclosure crisis—primarily the outcome of misdeeds of bankers and mortgage brokers—is driving further declines in home values while destroying once-vibrant neighborhoods. Joblessness also contributes to increased homelessness, which is not only tragic for families who lose their homes, but is accompanied by broader social harms and increased budget pressures on already strapped local and state governments.

Unemployed workers—along with many who are still employed—are losing employer-based health insurance coverage. In 2009, 50.7 million people were without health insurance—the highest number of uninsured since the Census started collecting the data in 1987. Joblessness is increasing pressure on public programs such as Medicaid, while increased use of uncovered emergency services by those with no other option for care is driving further increases in healthcare costs for small businesses and those still fortunate enough to have jobs and healthcare coverage.

Workers without jobs can't pay taxes that provide the resources to hire teachers, police and firefighters, build and maintain roads, provide for appropriate national security, ensure product safety, protect the environment, and fill urgent long- and short-term national needs.

We condemn the folly of deficit slashing while 15 million Americans remain unemployed—plus 11 million more who are underemployed or have dropped from the labor

force. Insufficient economic demand and idle productive capacity in the economy, in the short-term, bleeds federal and state budgets, whether or not current economic conditions meet the official definition of “recession.” Reckless spending (except perhaps for ill-conceived and poorly executed wars) is not the cause of our budget woes. This is made obvious as conservatives decry the deficit, but cannot or will not name any specific government program they would slash in order to meet their demands for deficit reduction.

Job creation—and the economic growth that spurs job creation—is the only way to reduce a budget deficit that is primarily the result of high unemployment. Unemployed workers represent idle productive capacity—lost wages and lost economic output. Lost wages reduce demand for goods, services, and investment, and depress tax receipts. Without consumers with money to spend, firms don't invest or hire, leading to more joblessness and still lower output. That leads to declining tax receipts along with growing demand for automatic stabilizers (such as unemployment benefits) and safety net services (such as Medicaid, food stamps, and housing assistance). Government deficits are inevitable in economic downturns with high unemployment.

Since firms will not hire or invest where demand is lacking, and unemployed workers cannot expand consumption and increase demand, only the government can spur growth—through deficit spending and investment. Tax cuts may be helpful, but in the current climate, direct spending and investment will more quickly and more strongly stimulate demand. Investing now in America's current and future prosperity is the remedy for both joblessness and the long-term budget deficit.

Conservatives argue that austerity will spur economic growth. That argument is based on evidence that fiscal austerity reduces interest rates (borrowing costs) for firms, and thus stimulates investment. But the evidence for this model does not mirror current conditions. Interest rates in the U.S. are already at historically low levels, yet firms are not investing or hiring. Moreover, few of the countries that experienced rapid growth while practicing fiscal austerity adopted austerity when the economy was operating far below its potential level of output, and in no case was a country as far below its potential as the U.S. is today.

Furthermore, all of the evidence that austerity fosters growth comes from countries with a much larger percentage of their economy involved in export industries than is the case with the U.S. Trade provides a source of demand for countries with a large export sector. The U.S. currently cannot rely on export-led growth to stimulate sufficient demand to reduce unemployment. For unemployment to be reduced in the short run, domestic demand must be increased. Thus, arguments for slashing government budgets in order to stimulate jobs and economic growth are not credible under current economic conditions.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) may have created or saved up to 3.3 million jobs and averted a second Great Depression, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates. But simple math shows that it was woefully insufficient to offset the loss of \$2.1 trillion in economic activity, \$3.4 trillion in lost home values, and \$7.4 trillion in lost stock values in 2009 and 2010. Not only was \$787 billion in

stimulus insufficient to offset the losses, it was also swamped by an estimated \$570 billion in spending cuts by state and local governments over the 2009–10 period.

Thus, the stimulus provided by ARRA and other measures amounted to only about \$126 billion per year for 2009 and 2010. The total effective stimulus was perhaps only 10% of the output lost.

By 2014, the CBO projects that total lost output will reach \$3.4 trillion—more than \$11,000 per person—assuming unemployment returns to normal levels by then. That figure will be worse if unemployment remains high. Additional and substantial economic stimulus that more realistically accounts for current economic realities is required, both to create jobs and to begin building the foundation for a prosperous future in which budget deficits can be reduced without causing economic contraction during a period of record unemployment.

The way to achieve a balanced federal budget is with a sound banking system and rational monetary policy; government investment (recognizing the difference between spending and investment); and full employment at decent wages and benefits.

We need jobs, and we have much work to do. A great nation can't remain great with crumbling bridges and schools, bursting water mains, leaking untreated sewage, grossly inadequate transportation systems, over-dependence on foreign oil, unaffordable higher education, and broadband preparedness that ranks 15th among OECD countries. ADA calls for restoring America's global competitive position with a restored manufacturing base, and rebuilt and expanded public infrastructure including broadband, throughout the nation.

A great nation consists of livable cities and towns that work for people, with decent affordable housing, quality public schools, well-designed and functioning public transportation systems, and jobs that provide decent wages. Cities cannot be warehouses for vast numbers of homeless and impoverished people who have no prospects and no hope.

A great nation will be at the forefront of addressing global problems that have resulted from past mistakes. Global warming, polluted water, and energy insecurity require investment in high-speed railroads and mass transit systems; emission-free vehicles and the infrastructure to power them; research, development, and construction of renewable energy sources, such as solar, wind, and waterpower.

America, with enforced fair labor standards and collective bargaining rights. To begin the process of restoring America's industrial-employment base, ADA calls for fair trade policies that promote economic activity and lift wages in all nations, including our own; reformed tax policies that reward companies for creating jobs here, rather than for shipping them overseas; and national and local purchasing goals that support American manufacturing.

For community restoration and further job growth, ADA calls for doubling funding for programs to employ youth—including high school dropouts, high school graduates, and college graduates. This includes expanding AmeriCorps, the Job Corps, and the Peace Corps, a renewed Civilian Conservation Corps to restore our national parks and forests, a Neighborhood Corps to protect, maintain and

revitalize (or as necessary demolish) distressed housing, and Home Care Corps providing services to the elderly in their own homes.

These ambitious programs, sparked by public investments, will generate millions of jobs that pay middle-class wages, serving urgent national needs and restoring the private economy. These are the necessary underpinning of a strong America.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security is under siege on multiple fronts, most of them familiar.

Social Security is not part of the budget deficit. It's been made a scapegoat by long-time enemies of the program. Social Security payments are, in fact, not government spending at all. Government spending includes the purchases of goods and services by government. Social Security payments are direct transfers from working people with more income to the elderly, disabled, widows and orphans who have less income, and who mostly contributed to the program during their working years. As such, a dollar reallocated from one final consumer to another has no direct effect on GDP whatsoever. Such transfers are fair and effective, increasing security and reducing poverty.

The Commission on Deficit Reduction is co-chaired by millionaire Erskine Bowles and former Senator Alan Simpson, who calls Social Security retirees "Greedy Geezers," as if either man would consider living on the average benefit of \$13,860 per year. The Commission includes only one economist; the rest are career politicians, most of whom have supported cuts to Social Security. And the Commission has accepted support from Peter G. Peterson, who has waged a relentless, decades-long campaign to cut Social Security and Medicare. The composition of the Commission is deeply flawed, including bias and conflicts of interest. Any proposal by the Commission regarding Social Security cuts should be rejected.

For two-thirds of the elderly, Social Security is at least half their income. About a third of the elderly rely on Social Security for most of their income. Social Security isn't in jeopardy, except from the Commission, other privatizers, and unemployment—jobless workers don't pay payroll taxes.

With no changes, Social Security can pay full benefits until 2039, and thereafter about 80% of currently scheduled benefits. Simple changes that don't damage the program, and make contributions more progressive, can be made. Changes in FICA tax policies for higher-income earners would make it possible to reduce contributions by lower income earners, making the system less regressive and helping to address the enormous income gap that has developed in the U.S. over the past 30 years. Policy options include:

Raising the cap on which the payroll tax (FICA) is applied above the current \$106,800; Removing the cap entirely; or

Applying the cap to all taxable income, including interest, dividends, and capital gains.

The payroll tax, currently accumulating a \$2.6 trillion surplus, is invested in U.S. government bonds, about the safest investment in the world.

Proposals to allow workers to contribute a portion of their FICA contributions to individual accounts are a sure way to undermine the entire Social Security system, and must be off the table. It may sound harmless, but siphon-

ing off funds earmarked for Social Security makes it impossible to pay for current benefits. Individual accounts held in investment funds would be subject to the ups and downs of the business cycle. For those fortunate enough to retire in good times, the accounts may be a good deal. For those reaching retirement in a downturn, the effect could be disastrous. They may have little more than a much-reduced Social Security benefit to survive on and face years of poverty in retirement. We should not forget the last two years and the disastrous effect of the recession on 401(k)s.

Baby boomers are retiring; our population is aging. Legislators noticed that in 1987 and took care of it by increasing the payroll tax, and by gradually increasing the retirement age to 67 by 2022. That increase in the normal retirement age cut benefits by 13%. Postponing retirement is tough for people who've had physically demanding jobs (unlike doctors, lawyers, economists, professors, and legislators). Recent data on longer life expectancy, the principal argument for raising the retirement age still further, have shown that longer life spans in the U.S. are principally a luxury for the well-off. Further, the life expectancy numbers are skewed because of declines in infant and young-adult mortality. Ordinary working Americans aren't living appreciably longer lives, and thus longer retirements are largely a myth.

We should also attract more young workers by creating an economically rational immigration policy.

Current undocumented workers should be given a path to citizenship. This will ensure that they are appropriately contributing taxes, while affording them protections they now lack, including protection from workplace discrimination, wage and overtime protections, workplace safety, and collective bargaining rights.

The Dream Act, a bill to provide citizenship to young people who were brought to this country as children, should be made law immediately. This would provide a path to citizenship for those who attend college or serve two years in the U.S. Armed Forces, and would help the U.S. retain the most successful, productive young immigrants.

Large numbers of the brightest students from around the world come to earn degrees from U.S. universities. Many wish to remain in the U.S., but our broken immigration system makes it nearly impossible for them to do so. We should be encouraging these graduates to remain in the U.S. on completion of their studies.

MINIMUM WAGE

The third prong of ADA's program is increasing and indexing the minimum wage. It lags at a shameful \$7.25 per hour, while Republicans call for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. At its current level, the minimum wage barely provides an annual income above the individual poverty level, and many minimum wage earners are trying to raise families. It is unconscionable that anyone working full time in America should be mired in poverty, unable to meet basic needs of shelter, food, heat, and clothing.

The minimum wage should be increased, and should in future be indexed to the Consumer Price Index, to ensure that it keeps pace with the rising cost of living.

Opponents of raising the minimum wage will say that it increases unemployment. The evi-

dence for this is extremely spotty. In some states that have increased their minimum wage, unemployment has declined relative to neighboring states that have maintained minimum wage at the federal level. In others, very small increases in unemployment were seen for the lowest-wage workers, and even those increases were temporary. Most of the economic research indicates that modest increases to the minimum wage have a negligible effect on employment, which is much more affected by other economic factors. The benefit of an increase to those workers at the minimum wage level outweighs the negligible effect on employment levels, and ADA strongly supports action on legislation to adjust the current minimum. ADA forged the coalition that led to the last increase in the minimum wage, and we can do so again.

All three prongs of ADA's program—JOBS, SOCIAL SECURITY, and MINIMUM WAGE—are of a piece, and are essential to restoring the American middle class. The Republicans are raring to enact slashing cuts that mirror those of the Tories of the UK, a formula for a double-dip recession or worse. We know better. Americans need jobs. Our country needs refurbishing. Workers need jobs that pay for housing, food, education, and a decent standard of living. Workers pay Social Security taxes, so the elderly, disabled, widows, and orphans can survive above poverty. And minimum wage workers must not be left behind. ADA stands ready to build the Liberal movement to carry out this agenda.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chair, my Republican colleagues have introduced a bill to end Medicare as we know it in order to pay for tax giveaways to millionaires and profitable companies.

Listening to the President's speech yesterday, and to my colleagues on the floor today, I'm convinced that this debate is about no less than the values we hold as Americans. As the President said, the Republican budget is less about reducing the deficit than it is about changing the basic social compact in America.

Do we want to live in an America where opportunity is snatched away from young people who want an education, or one where any student who works hard enough can find a way to succeed?

Do we want to live in an America where our seniors can retire with dignity after a lifetime of hard work, or one where the elderly must ask their children for the spare room they might not even have to give?

Much of what the President has proposed has yet to be fleshed out in detail, and I hope

we can come together to develop a serious budget plan.

But for now, let us debate the values underpinning this discussion—the fundamental choice between a vision that offers extreme ideology, out-of-touch with the everyday struggles and hopes of American families, versus one that offers a path to future competitiveness in the global economy, and a renewed opportunity to achieve the American Dream. I know which one I'll choose.

JESSICA JERKE TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an unmatched honor for me to stand and pay tribute to the short, yet remarkable, life of Jessica Jerke of La Salle, Colorado. She was a young woman who accomplished more in her 21 years than most people can achieve in a lifetime. Jessica truly devoted herself to a life of selflessness and compassion to everyone she interacted with.

Ms. Jessica Jerke was born in Greeley, Colorado, and was an inspiration to her friends and family throughout her life. She was a member of the Greeley Children's Chorale, as well as a member of the Continental Singers. Jessica had even written and recorded some of her own music. Jessica graduated from University High School in 2008 where she was a member of the choir, the dance team, and the tennis team. She was also a devout Christian who possessed a deep faith, and had a strong relationship with God. Jessica was so committed to her faith that she went on two mission trips to Costa Rica and India to try to help those that were less fortunate than her.

Jessica attended Colorado Christian University where she studied music education, and in her 2nd semester of college she began to show symptoms of the unknown disease that she would fiercely battle for the next two years. Physicians from around the nation could not diagnose what was wrong with her. As her conditioned worsened, Jessica continued to flash her beautiful smile, never losing her winning attitude, and grew closer to her Lord. Jessica wanted no gifts as she celebrated her 21st birthday from a wheel chair, but asked that people make donations to the Christian mission in India instead. Jessica was a true embodiment of the Christian ideals that she held so closely.

Jessica Jerke demonstrated true grace in the face of misfortune, and our nation has lost a great citizen of the world. Mr. Speaker it has been a privilege to stand before you and pay tribute to the life of this extraordinary young lady.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to draw your attention to a letter from Secretary Sebelius on the impact of H. Con. Res. 34.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, Washington, DC, April 14, 2011.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN, Ranking Member, House Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER WAXMAN: We received your letter today requesting our assessment of the impact of the enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 35 (H. Con. Res. 35) on Medicare, Medicaid, and the other affected health programs at the Department of Health and Human Services. We have not yet had an opportunity to fully evaluate the extensive impact that the language of the resolution would have, but offer a few initial observations.

As you know, the Affordable Care Act modifies and improves almost every Medicare payment system—including the inpatient hospital prospective payment system, the outpatient hospital prospective payment system, the physician fee schedule, Medicare Advantage plan payments, and prescription drug plan payments. If this resolution were enacted, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) would not be able to use any funds to carry out these payment provisions based on any rate calculated on the basis of provisions of the Affordable Care Act—which is to say virtually all rates.

In a system in which millions of claims are paid each week, millions of claims would accumulate, which CMS and its contractors would be prohibited from paying. As a result, providers and suppliers of services to Medicare beneficiaries—many of which are small businesses—would experience significant disruption.

H. Con. Res. 35 would adversely affect health care in rural areas as well. As an example, as a means to encourage physicians to provide services in rural areas, the Affordable Care Act established a new 10 percent bonus payment for primary care services furnished by primary care practitioners and for major surgical procedures furnished by general surgeons in shortage areas. Without available funding, CMS would no longer be able to provide the bonus to primary care and general surgery physicians for eligible services.

The Affordable Care Act also gives CMS new tools to fight fraud and helps us move from a pay-and-chase system to a comprehensive prevention-focused strategy. By precluding the use of funds for such efforts, H. Con. Res. 35 would substantially impede CMS's proven and successful efforts to reduce fraud and waste in the health care system resulting in increased erroneous payments. H. Con. Res. 35 would effectively require CMS to cease enforcing new screening and enrollment standards, diminish CMS's ability to suspend payments when credible allegations of fraud are uncovered, and reduce resources that have been made available for investments in anti-fraud work.

The Affordable Care Act also includes numerous other policies to make health care more affordable, accessible, and accountable for seniors, individuals with disabilities, children, and all other Americans, as well as businesses large and small. Its improvements are already woven into the fabric of our health care system. A broad prohibition on the use of funds would halt, among other things, the operation of the Early Retiree Reinsurance Program, the Pre-existing Con-

dition Insurance Plan, and the health insurance rate review, consumer assistance, and health insurance Exchange grant programs.

I hope this information is helpful. We would be pleased to answer any additional questions you may have. I have sent an identical letter to Ranking Member Levin.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN SEBELIUS.

HONORING ARMY STAFF SERGEANT JORGE ANTONIO SCATLIFFE

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Army Staff Sergeant Jorge Antonio Scatliffe, who died in Mosul, Iraq, on April 3, 2011, in support of Operation New Dawn. Staff Sergeant Scatliffe was the 7th soldier from my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, to die in the Middle East since the outbreak of hostilities in the wake of the tragedy of September 11, 2001.

Staff Sergeant Scatliffe, 32, was assigned to E Company, 27th Brigade Support Battalion, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas. He grew up on the island of St. Croix and attended the Lew Muckle Elementary School, the Elena Christian Junior High School, St. Croix Central High School and was one of the first graduates of the St. Croix Educational Complex.

Staff Sergeant Scatliffe joined the Army in April of 1998 as a Bradley Fighting Vehicle system maintenance man. His first deployments to Iraq began in April 2003 and ended in 2004. He was redeployed in December 2005 and served until December 2006 and once again from June 2008 to May 2009. Staff Sergeant Scatliffe was on his fourth tour of duty in Iraq, which he began in 2010 and ended tragically on April 3rd of this year, when he gave the ultimate sacrifice for his country, his precious life.

Staff Sergeant Scatliffe received many awards and decorations which includes two Army Commendation Medals, three Army Achievement Medals, four Army Good Conduct Medals, a National Defense Service Medal, an Iraqi Campaign Medal with campaign stars, a Global War on Terrorism Medal, Overseas Service Ribbons, an Army Service Ribbon, a Driver and Mechanic Badge for Mechanics, a Driver and Mechanic Badge for Wheel Vehicle Drivers and a Driver and Mechanic Badge for Tracked Vehicle Drivers.

Mr. Speaker, Staff Sergeant Scatliffe was a man who deeply loved his family, especially his mother, Sarah, with whom he maintained a close relationship. He is also mourned by his brothers, Robert and Raymond, and a circle of family, friends and fellow soldiers who are broken hearted at the loss of an exceptional young man.

I extend my sincere condolences to the family, friends and fellow soldiers of Staff Sergeant Jorge Scatliffe on behalf of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands, the U.S. Congress and the entire nation. Your service and your sacrifice will not be forgotten.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone in this Chamber that America is the greatest country the world has ever known. America has the most innovative people and continues to be a lure to others seeking greater opportunities and a better and brighter life in the largest and most spectacular economy in the world.

I'm sure many of us know the story of something else that was considered to be the largest and most spectacular thing the world has ever seen. It was considered to be UNSINKABLE. While there has been a lot of talk about America's "Sputnik moment," I think we should be as focused on the possibility of facing America's TITANIC moment, today being the 99th anniversary of the sinking of the Titanic.

It may be a coincidence that we are debating America's future on this anniversary. However, we must keep this disaster in mind as we debate America's fiscal future. Mr. Chair, because unsinkable ships do sink! If we do not pass Chairman RYAN's budget then America will continue down a path that will sink the most vibrant economy that has served as a beacon for people looking for a brighter future.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF
JAMES KEYGES ON HIS OFFER
OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that James Keyges of Greenwich, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

James brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming class of 2015. He is the recipient of a Falcon Foundation Scholarship and recently graduated from the Northwestern Preparatory School in Santa Barbara, California. James is an active member of Ripley Church and spent many of the past years participating in the church's youth group. He subsequently was employed as a member of the church's staff where he was responsible for audio and technical support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating James Keyges on the ac-

ceptance of his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy where he will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that James will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the nation.

GAINES WYLIE SHULTS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gaines Wylie Shults of Mosca, Colorado. Mr. Shults owned and operated a number of small businesses in Texas and Colorado and was one of the founding members of the National Rifle Association.

Mr. Shults was born and raised in Rising Star, Texas, before eventually deciding to join the Texas National Guard. He had a zest for flying and took every opportunity to do so during his service. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor he was transferred to the Navy as a flight instructor, where his efforts contributed to our country's victory in the Pacific Theater.

Mr. Shults' love of flying brought him to Colorado, where he eventually ran the Alamosa Airport. On his way he founded Silver State Aviation, a crop dusting and charter business. It was a natural outlet for his skills in aviation and knowledge of agriculture.

His career pursuits were not limited to aviation, however. Mr. Shults had a talent for ranching and operated Broken Heart Land and Cattle Company for several years. He loved the outdoors and spent as much free time as possible hunting, fishing and flying.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Gaines Shults today. He was a veteran, entrepreneur and leader. There is no doubt his legacy will continue to impact rural Colorado.

A TRIBUTE TO RAMON C.
CORTINES, SUPERINTENDENT OF
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ramon C. Cortines for his lengthy and distinguished career as an educator. Mr. Cortines will be retiring shortly as the Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District. His tenure as Superintendent of the LAUSD has capped off a 55-year career in education that has taken Mr. Cortines to schools all across the country and has demonstrated his passion for both education and public service. His dedication to our Nation's children is admirable, and I stand today to commend his service as a teacher, mentor, administrator and advocate.

The breadth of Mr. Cortines' experience in education is impressive. His work both in and out of the classroom has focused on improving education in this country. As an administrator and public servant at the State and Fed-

eral levels, Mr. Cortines used the perspective he gained in the classroom to address the educational challenges this country faces from a big-picture perspective.

While Mr. Cortines has worked for schools all across the country, he spent a considerable portion of his career in California. He started in 1956 as a teacher in Aptos, California and went on to hold numerous positions in schools and districts across the State. This service included time as superintendent in Pasadena, San Jose, San Francisco and finally Los Angeles.

Mr. Cortines has also lent his expertise to many taskforces and governmental agencies. He worked at both the State and Federal levels on education policy, as well as for many non-profit foundations dedicated to improving education. Mr. Cortines has also held numerous positions in academia at Universities across the country, sharing his expansive knowledge with the next generation of educators and policy makers.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring Ramon C. Cortines for his exceptional service to the community.

HONORING NANCY KURK, THE DE-
PARTMENT PRESIDENT OF THE
AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Kurk, who is the Department President of the American Legion Auxiliary Department of New York. Department President Kurk is currently serving as the Department President for the 2010-2011 term. Nancy has selflessly served the American Legion Auxiliary and her community for over 30 years.

As Department President, one of her main initiatives is the "Hats Off to Homeless Veterans," which is expected to raise \$50,000. All the money raised during this endeavor will either be designated to a specific shelter by the donor or, if unspecified, will be donated to the Zion House, a shelter for homeless female veterans from all across New York.

Raising funds for homeless veterans is only the latest in a long line of accomplishments for Department President Kurk. For over 30 years she has demonstrated commendable service and dedication towards the American Legion Auxiliary and has devoted her time to numerous hours of volunteer service to helping our Veterans. In fact, during the current term, she has visited all 62 counties in the State of New York in support of American Legion Auxiliary activities.

Department President Kurk is a 34-year member of the Robson-Savage Unit No. 546 and also currently serves Yates County as Legislative and Past President's Parley Chairman. Among her many notable achievements, Department President Kurk has served twice as Field Day Chairman at the Canandaigua VAMC. Additionally, she has also serviced the American Legion Auxiliary Department as VAVS Deputy and Poppy Supervisor at the Canandaigua Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Nancy is also an Independent Living Skills Trainer with Sibley Nursing Personnel, Inc.,

where she helps individuals who have suffered from traumatic brain injury to regain their personal independence both at home and within the community.

So in conclusion, I am proud to recognize and honor one of the finest servants of the 29th District of New York, Nancy Kurk. The years of service she has rendered to the American Legion Auxiliary and to our local communities is invaluable, and I commend her for all of her accomplishments.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND
FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I oppose this legislation. The President and Senator REID worked as hard as they possibly could to blunt the extreme Republican agenda. As everyone knows, these spending cuts are before us today because the Republicans did not hesitate to resort to the most irresponsible tactics to try to enforce their radical agenda.

While there are some program cuts I can support, others harm programs affecting millions of Americans. I am particularly concerned by the cuts to Community Health Centers (\$600 million from last year's spending levels), Health Care Facilities and Activities (\$338 million), Women and Infant Children programs (\$504 million), Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs (\$438 million), Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving funds (\$997 million), Climate Change programs (\$49 million), HIV AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention (\$730 million), LIHEAP (Low income energy assistance) (\$390 million), U.S. Agency for International Development (\$39 million), International Clean Technology Fund (\$115 million), Highway Construction (\$2.5 billion), and High Speed Rail (\$2.9 billion).

For all the effort made, these cuts in funding do not have any significant impact on the deficit. Because of the Republicans' ideological blinders, taxes and revenues get no consideration here. The deficit cannot be solved without addressing revenues, and the silence on this issue from the Republican Party is deafening.

I also must register my profound objection to the rider attached in this bill that prohibits the District of Columbia Government from funding abortions. By what moral right does the Republican leadership override unilaterally the sovereign decisions taken by the government and people of the District of Columbia? This is shameful and deeply offensive and I hope Congress can find the strength ultimately to reverse it.

Again, I believe President Obama and Senator REID did the very best they could under near-impossible circumstances deliberately engineered by the Republican leadership. Unfortunately, this bill will inflict too big a price on many programs the American people and our country need. I must therefore vote against it.

WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA
BEING RECOGNIZED AS "AMERICA'S
WORLD WAR II CITY"

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to the City of Wilmington, North Carolina, for its remarkable contributions to the U.S. war efforts during World War II. Its rich World War II legacy reminds us not only of its unique and pivotal role in the war, but also of the honorable dedication of all North Carolinians during our nation's time of need. As a reflection of its unique and pivotal role, and its deep and unmatched sacrifice, I stand to proclaim that Wilmington, North Carolina, should be recognized as "America's World War II City." In fact, both the New Hanover County Commissioners and City Council have proclaimed it so!

During World War II, Wilmington was the country's unique wartime boomtown, aptly and officially named "The Defense Capital of the State." The once-quiet seaside city, geographically isolated for decades, suddenly found itself an exploding center for military life and defense production.

Wilmington's wartime efforts were extensive and honorable. Wilmington based and trained all five military services—the Air Force at the Wilmington Airport, the Army at Camp Davis and Fort Fisher, the Navy at Fort Caswell, the Coast Guard at Wrightsville Beach, and the Marine Corps at Camp Lejeune. The North Carolina Shipbuilding Company of Wilmington, the state's largest employer at that time, constructed 243 cargo vessels with which to provide goods and equipment to our soldiers. Additionally, Wilmington provided the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad headquarters, three housing camps for German prisoners of war, a major training base for P-47 fighters, defense industries producing goods and equipment, a British patrol base, and a shipping point for Lend Lease supplies to the Allies.

Wilmington's most important contribution by far, though, was its dispatch of thousands of its sons and daughters to fight the enemy. These New Hanover County men and women served in uniform, fighting on land, sea, and air as Navy frogmen, P-51 fighter aces, Tuskegee airmen, submarine skippers, bomber pilots, Marine riflemen, Army artillerymen, physicians and nurses, and volunteers of all sorts. Tragically, 248 Wilmington men bravely lost their lives as a result of their courageous efforts to defend America. Two New Hanover High School graduates received the Congressional Medal of Honor and numerous others received high decorations for valor, including Navy Crosses, Distinguished Service Crosses, and Distinguished Flying Crosses.

Furthermore, Wilmington's strategic position made it vulnerable to enemy attack by German U-boats, which marauded shipping off our beaches. In July 1943 a U-boat fired at the Ethel-Dow chemical plant in Wilmington, perhaps the only German attack on America. Wilmington endured this attack, as well as constant civilian defense restrictions and air raid drills, including black-outs and dim-outs. The city's population more than doubled with the influx of military personnel, forcing locals to cope with strain on housing and schools,

transportation, medical and social services, law enforcement, and food supply.

Mr. Speaker, Wilmingtonians sacrificed in every imaginable way when our nation needed them during World War II. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognition and appreciation of Wilmington's contributions to the U.S. war effort during World War II. Now, in the spirit of that appreciation, let it be known that Wilmington, North Carolina, should be recognized as "America's World War II City."

HONORING REVEREND JAMES C.
HARRIS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend James C. Harris, a great man of God, for his 60 years of service as the pastor of Mt. Pilgrim Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

James Calvin Harris was born in Lee County, Georgia, on April 7, 1925, to the late Elijah and Viola Harris. He was the seventh of eight children and first became a member of St. Matthew Baptist Church of Lee County, Georgia under the late Rev. Allen A. Green. Rev. Green licensed James Harris into the Christian ministry on July 9, 1939, and later ordained him on August 10, 1949.

Rev. Harris served our country in the United States Navy during World War II, and married Miss Maggie Jefferson in 1944. He later attended Albany State College (now Albany State University), and finished his seminary work at the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee.

He first became a pastor at New Point Baptist Church in Arlington, Georgia, and preached at six other churches before finding his home at Mt. Pilgrim in 1951. Throughout his tenure, Mt. Pilgrim has become more involved in the community because of Rev. Harris' belief that the church and its congregation have a responsibility to be there for those in the community who are less fortunate or downtrodden.

In 1985, he received the Best Congress Award for excellence in execution of the Program of Christian Education Department from the National Baptist Convention's Sunday School Publishing Board—the highest award in the field of Christian Education. In 1991, he received the Sergeant Major Award for spiritual personnel at Fort Benning, GA, and in 2004, the National Baptist Convention again recognized him with the Service Award for his 50 years of service as a pastor to the same church.

There is a reason Reverend Harris is known as the "sharing minister." Because of his dedication to serving the community, Mt. Pilgrim is known as the caring and sharing church. He has always been available to mentor young ministers trying to find their way, providing guidance and direction whenever needed.

Under Rev. Harris' leadership, the outreach ministries he created have helped establish a Baptist Church in Camp Long, Korea, a jail-house ministry at the Muscogee County Jail in Columbus, and several Christian education programs. By reaching out to those in need and comforting those who are suffering, the

church has become a source of spiritual support for people all across the world.

Rev. Harris has been a friend, advisor, counselor and supporter from the time I first met him in 1972. My wife and I truly cherish his friendship and support.

On the occasion of his 60th anniversary as pastor of Mt. Pilgrim Baptist Church, it is a privilege to recognize Reverend Harris for his decades of service to the Columbus community and to God. His unwavering commitment to the ministry and the Columbus community should be celebrated, and I hope that he continues to sing "He's a Battle Ax" and spread the word of God for years to come. To God Be The Glory!

ERNEST AND LOUISE ANITA
EVANS ROMERO TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ernest and Louise Anita Evans Romero, of Pueblo Colorado. Mrs. Romero, a very successful nurse for many years, passed away in 1994 but is remembered by the immensely successful scholarship fund created by Mr. Romero in her honor.

The Romero Nurse Scholarship Fund awards grants to St. Mary-Corwin nurses so that they might study more advanced nursing techniques. The Fund has given 17 scholarships to St. Mary-Corwin nurses since it was created. It is an appropriate honor for those who display the same talent and dedication to nursing as Louise Romero did for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Romero for their longtime service to the community. Through the Fund created by Ernest Romero, deserving nurses will be able to pursue the same excellence Louise Romero strived towards during her life. There is no doubt their impact will be felt in Colorado for many years.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ASHLEY MOHR ON HER OFFERS OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, AND THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young woman from Ohio's fifth congressional district. I am happy to announce that Ashley Mohr of Van Wert, Ohio has been offered appointments to attend the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy. Ashley has accepted the offer to attend the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Ashley brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming

Class of 2015. While attending Van Wert High School in Van Wert, Ohio, Ashley attained a 4.0 GPA, was a member and vice president of Student Council, Senior Class president, member of BETA Club, French Club, Varsity V-Club and participated in choir and journalism. She received numerous academic awards.

Throughout high school, Ashley was a team member of the track, basketball and soccer teams, where she received varsity letters. Ashley demonstrated her dedication and service to her community and peers by being active in Junior Rotarians as a Cougar Mentor Team member, as a member of First Presbyterian Church and volunteer referee for the Upward Soccer Program. I am confident that Ashley will carry the lessons of her student leadership to West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ashley Mohr on the acceptance of her appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point where she will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Ashley will excel during her career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the nation.

REMEMBERING BRAVE PATRIOTS
OF BRIGADE 2506

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the brave patriots of Brigade 2506, and their American co-fighters, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Bay of Pigs Invasion.

On April 17, 1961, 1,400 brave Cuban men landed along the beaches of the Bay of Pigs. Although the Brigade was outnumbered and out-supplied, it managed to inflict massive damages on Castro's military. Those brave fighters were a cross-section of Cuban society. They were doctors, students, and farmers. Some were only teenagers. They were supported by four brave Alabama pilots who ignored their superiors' orders to abandon the brigade and their mission. When the smoke cleared and the fighting ended, the survivors endured nearly two years of torture by some of the most sadistic, expertly trained torturers the world has ever known—on the direct orders of Cuba's cruel dictator.

Today, that dictatorship is failing. When that oppressive regime finally dies, the Cuban people will be rid of the shackles that have burdened them for decades. The heroes of the Bay of Pigs invasion were early warriors in the struggle for the freedom of the Cuban people. History will remember them not only for their heroism on the beaches of Playa Girón, but also for their role in the ultimate liberation of the homeland of José Martí.

The U.S. Congress is an especially fitting venue to commemorate a day of such importance to both Cuban and American history. It is appropriate that on this day, and in this place, we remember the Cuban people's call for a true democratic transition, the recognition of basic human rights, the adherence to the rule of law, those heroic freedom fighters of Brigade 2506 and the four brave Alabama pi-

lots who refused to abandon their Cuban brothers. We free Americans must continue to stand with the long-suffering Cuban people at this critical time in their history.

I humbly and with gratitude salute the brave patriots who attempted to liberate the Cuban people from tyranny fifty years ago. Their sacrifice, and their valor, will never be forgotten.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NISEI FARMERS LEAGUE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Mr. CARDOZA to congratulate the Nisei Farmers League on the occasion of its 40th anniversary celebration. The Nisei Farmers League has made a significant impact on the San Joaquin Valley and throughout California by representing the interest of growers, packers, processors and their employees. Over its 40 years of service, the Nisei Farmers League has helped to create a strong support network that helps western agricultural interests meet the many challenges faced in today's international marketplace.

The Nisei Farmers League was founded in 1971 by a small group of Japanese-American growers who met to discuss the increasing challenges facing California agriculture. Within months of the original meeting more growers joined the group and the decision was made to take the name of "Nisei," the term for second-generation Americans of Japanese ancestry. Under the direction of founder Mr. Harry Kubo, who served as leader of the league for 25 years, the organization worked to confront the challenges faced by small growers during farm union activities in the 1970s. Acting as a mutual protection society, the Nisei Farmers League has proven to be extremely effective in advocating on behalf of its members.

Evolving over the years, the league is now a sophisticated voice for more than a thousand members representing the broad diversity of California and the western United States' farmers and ranchers, and advocates on an array of issues at the local, State and Federal levels.

Today, led by Mr. Manuel Cunha, the Nisei Farmers League serves more than 1,100 growers, packers, and processors who grow and pack a diverse range of crops throughout California and the western United States. From the bountiful fields of California to the halls of the United States Congress, the Nisei Farmers League is respected and should be honored for its tireless efforts on behalf of western agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and Mr. CARDOZA in recognizing the hard work and dedication that the Nisei Farmers League has put forth throughout its many years of service to growers throughout California. I congratulate the Nisei Farmers League on its many years of dedicated and successful work in California, and wish the group many successful years to come.

CONGRESSIONAL VICTIMS' RIGHTS CAUCUS AWARDS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, during National Crime Victims' Rights Week, to congratulate the winner of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus Awards.

Congressman JIM COSTA of California and I are the co-founders and co-chairs of the Victims' Rights Caucus, a bi-partisan group of 60 members who work to be a voice for victims' rights in Congress and before the administration.

Last week, we honored six incredible individuals who have made a real difference in the lives of victims and have greatly influenced the victims' rights movement.

Some of the award recipients, including my nominee, Jess Smochek, were victims themselves and are now fighting for other victims' rights and changes in the system.

Jess was terribly beaten, raped, and left for dead while volunteering for the Peace Corps in Bangladesh.

The Peace Corps basically ignored Jess and did nothing to aid her in a time of great need.

Jess found out that other volunteers in the Peace Corps, who were victimized during their service, were treated the same way.

Instead of letting this go on, Jess took her awful experience and decided to advocate for a change in the Peace Corps policy toward victims.

Because of her bravery in speaking out about this tough issue, the national media and Congress are aware of this unacceptable matter and are working with her to push for changes in the Peace Corps.

We honored her with the Suzanne McDaniel Public Awareness Award because of her hard work to ensure no other selfless volunteer in the Peace Corps has to endure this treatment.

Helga Luest is another award recipient who chose to seek change in the system after having a traumatic experience as a crime victim.

After a brutal attack that almost cost her and her mother's lives, Helga began an organization called Witness Justice that works to help victims seek justice and experience healing.

She is able to help countless victims with her first-hand knowledge of trauma and its direct impact on the well being of the individual.

Helga received the Eva Murillo Unsung Hero Award because it truly takes a hero to rise up and use lessons from a terrible situation to help others.

We also recognized heroes in the victims' rights community that directly aid crime victims through their work at shelters and with programs that assist victims and facilitate healing.

Pam Kallsen, nominated by Victims' Rights Caucus Co-Chair Congressman JIM COSTA, is the Executive Director of the Marjaree Mason Center in California's Central Valley.

Through her leadership, the Center goes above and beyond traditional services providing legal representation, hotline services, and counseling sessions all of which are critical in responding to and preventing domestic and sexual abuse.

Another exceptional leader in the field is Mary Ellen Stone, the Executive Director of

the King County Sexual Assault Resource Center (KCSARC) in Washington State, a position in which she has served since 1979.

Mary Ellen has not only helped KCSARC grow to be the largest sexual assault victims' service organization in the state but has also been involved in transforming the legal and political landscape of sexual assault violence in Washington and throughout the nation.

Without these exemplary individuals, many victims would have nowhere to turn when facing a difficult situation and that is why these two wonderful women received the Ed Stout Memorial Award for Outstanding Victim Advocacy.

A leader on the public policy front, receiving the the Lois Haight Award for Excellence and Innovation is Susan Smith Howley, Director of Public Policy for the National Center for Victims of Crime.

She has devoted the past 20 years to the development and implementation of major crime victim related public policy initiatives at the local, state and national levels.

Not long ago crime victims had few to no rights, and we are still working hard to ensure victims receive all the care and compensation they deserve.

People like Susan, who work to ensure that the government protects innocent victims through creating and promoting innovative policies, are invaluable to victims throughout the country.

Our last award, the Allied Professional Award was presented to Nilda Valmores who has dedicated her life to helping victims of domestic violence.

The shelter where she serves as Executive Director, My Sister's House, focuses on the needs of immigrant Asian/Pacific Islander women and children.

Through Nilda's collaborations with organizations throughout her community, My Sister's House and the larger issue of domestic violence facing immigrant women has received much needed attention.

Congratulations to these amazing people, who are the reason why the victims' rights movement has made so much progress.

And that's just the way it is.

A TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH REDENBAUGH

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Elizabeth Redenbaugh, of Wilmington, North Carolina, who has been named an honoree of the John F. Kennedy Profile in Courage Award. On May 23, 2011, Mrs. Redenbaugh will be recognized for standing up to racial and socioeconomic segregation perceived in the New Hanover County school system.

The John F. Kennedy Library Foundation will be presenting the award. Caroline Kennedy, the President of the Foundation, has said of Mrs. Redenbaugh: "She boldly challenged the citizens of her community to preserve quality public education for all of New Hanover County's children regardless of race." In light of these acts, the foundation's committee saw fit to bestow upon Elizabeth

Redenbaugh what is generally seen as the highest honor available to United States public servants.

As well as serving on the New Hanover County School Board, Mrs. Redenbaugh practices as an attorney with Redenbaugh & Risser, PLLC. So committed is she to public service that she serves as a member of Parsley Elementary School's Site Based Management Team and PTA Board of Directors and also as a member of the New Hanover County Council of PTAs' Executive Board. Her tenacious efforts in Southeastern North Carolina are those of a true leader utterly dedicated to the betterment of local education, and her community as a whole.

Mrs. Redenbaugh's personal courage and political courage are to be congratulated. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing a local heroine, whose principled efforts in the face of robust opposition might serve as an example to us all. Let us celebrate a noble public servant, soon to be the recipient of an award intent on decorating those who choose principle over partisanship, a quality we should all strive to emulate for the good of the United States.

DR. DAVID SVALDI TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. David Svaldi of Alamosa, Colorado. Dr. Svaldi was recently appointed to El Pomar Foundation's San Luis Valley Regional Council. As one of southern Colorado's most esteemed residents he will undoubtedly thrive in that position.

Dr. Svaldi is president of Adams State College, a job he balances with his other volunteer work. He sits on the boards of the area's Boys and Girls Club, Health Education Council and the Southern Colorado Education Consortium.

The education and health industries in southern Colorado are growing quickly. It is important that people like Dr. Svaldi, who have a history of involvement and success in those areas, lend their expertise to the growing infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it is a honor to recognize Dr. David Svaldi today. He will continue to be a leader in his community and work to better the lives of his neighbors.

MEDICAL COMMUNITY UNDER ATTACK IN BAHRAIN

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern regarding a serious human rights crisis that is currently unfolding in Bahrain, a strategic ally of the United States in the Middle East.

As Physicians for Human Rights has reported, the medical community in that country has come under attack by Bahrani authorities during the currently ongoing unrest, and doctors, nurses and emergency medical technicians have been arrested, detained, harassed

and prevented from fulfilling their ethical obligations of providing medical care.

In doing so, the government of Bahrain is violating well-established laws of medical neutrality.

Just this Monday, April 11, at least six physicians were arrested by the government of Bahrain in its sweeping campaign against medical professionals over the past several weeks. Those arrested on that day include Dr. Abdulshaheed Fadhel, Dr. Jawad Khamees, Dr. Zahra Alsamak, Dr. Arif Rajab, Dr. Nabeel Hameed, and Dr. Nabeel Tammam.

I call on the State Department to do everything in its power to facilitate the release of these individuals and to bring an end to similar attacks on the medical profession in Bahrain.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN HEALTH INITIATIVE ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of The Violence Against Women Health Initiative Act, legislation that will bring the resources and expertise of the health sector to bear on the persistent problem of domestic and sexual violence.

I invite you to join me today in the fight to preserve the fundamental dignity and safety of women across this great nation—a right to safety and security that should never be abrogated, and yet is under threat every day.

Every nine seconds, a woman is abused in the United States. And every year, women are subjected to 4.8 million assaults and rapes by their intimate partners. According to 2009 statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of the 1,928 women murdered, 609 were wives murdered by their husbands; and 472 were girlfriends murdered by their significant other.

While no sector of society is left untouched by violence against women, the health care system is particularly impacted by violence and abuse.

Recent studies show that abuse victims use health care services between 2 and 2.5 times that of those who are not victims of abuse. More than 20 years of research connects child and adult exposure to domestic and sexual violence to asthma, stroke, heart disease, cancer, and depression. Intimate partner rape, physical assault, and stalking costs the health care system over \$8.3 billion annually.

In this period of elevated unemployment rates, there is particular cause for concern. The rate of violence in a relationship nearly doubles when a man is unemployed at least once. The rate of violence almost triples when a man experiences multiple periods of unemployment. In this economic recession, we have to be even more vigilant to prevent violence against women.

The health care system is uniquely positioned to take a leading role in fighting and responding to the prevalence of violence.

Victims know and trust their health care providers. Almost three-quarters of survivors say that they would like their health care providers to ask them about violence and abuse.

Multiple clinical studies have shown that short interventions in the medical environment

protect the health and safety of women. These interventions are short—between two and ten minutes—and effective. In repeated clinical trials, violence decreased and health status improved following simple assessment and referral protocols. Integrating these effective protocols into our health care system will save lives.

Indeed, routine assessment for intimate partner violence has been recommended for health care settings by the American Medical Association, American Psychological Association, American Nurses Association, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Academy of Pediatrics, and the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations.

Efforts by the health care system to prevent and respond to violence and abuse against women are built upon the success of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), first passed in 1994.

Since its passage, the Violence Against Women Act has transformed our criminal justice and social service system. Between 1993 and 2008, the rate of intimate partner violence dropped 53%. Clearly, we are on the right track.

Yet we need to do more.

Despite the commitment of the health field to help victims of violence and abuse, a critical gap remains in the delivery of health care to victims. Health care providers often only address current injuries, without tackling the underlying cause of those injuries. This highlights the need to ensure that health care providers have the necessary training and support in order to assess, refer, and support victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Today, I introduced the “Violence Against Women Health Initiative Act” as the first step in reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, helping the health care system to become a major player in the fight against violence against women. This bill would reauthorize three health programs; changes in the legislation will prioritize evaluation and accountability, as well as to expand the types of medical stakeholders engaged in this important effort.

There should be no safe harbor for those who perpetrate domestic violence and sexual assault in the twenty-first century.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR DISASTER

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today, as we conclude legislative business for the month of April in Washington, D.C., it is appropriate that we mark an important milestone in Ukraine: On April 26th, 2011, we recognize the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster.

On this date in 1986, Reactor Four at the Soviet-designed Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant in northern Ukraine exploded, releasing more than 100 tons of lethally radioactive material into the environment. The human cost of this disaster is staggering. It is unlikely we will ever know how many deaths can be directly

attributed to the Chernobyl disaster, but the loss of life of even one life is truly a tragedy.

Twenty-five years later, the consequences of the world's worst nuclear accident continue to plague Eastern Europe. Ukraine has been especially impacted. The World Health Organization estimates that over 6,000 people have been diagnosed with thyroid cancer from the radioactive materials in the atmosphere. The concrete and steel sarcophagus that encases the ruined Nuclear Reactor Four is deteriorating and in need of replacement. In addition, the loss of Chernobyl's generating capacity exacerbates an already difficult energy shortage in Ukraine, which depends heavily on energy imports, especially during harsh winters.

We must be mindful that Chernobyl's legacy remains a heavy burden for the people of Ukraine. The fatally flawed nuclear technology that built Chernobyl resulted in lasting harm to Ukraine's people and the environment. The sole consolation is that we can yet hope to redress the damage.

We must continue to support U.S. and international efforts to address the lingering health, social, and economic consequences from the disaster, including the permanent encasement of the damaged nuclear Reactor Four in Chernobyl. I call on every Member of the House to join with me in remembering the victims of this tragedy and to support these efforts. Let us resolve to do our part to help Ukraine build a better future.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK EVANS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Congressman Frank Evans of Pueblo, Colorado. Mr. Evans represented Colorado's third district for 14 years and was considered one of the most professional and courteous members of the House of Representatives. In fitting tribute, Pueblo's Government Printing Office will be renamed after the Congressman next month.

Mr. Evans was responsible for bringing the distribution center to his hometown and was proud of the recognition it gave to what was, at the time, a very small town. It is a testament to his hard work while in office. He fought diligently for residents of the district and never forgot those who elected him to Congress. He enjoyed great success in office, never lost an election, and took great care to avoid making enemies on either side of the aisle.

Mr. Evans grew up in Colorado and went to Pomona College before enlisting in the Navy at the outbreak of World War II. During the War he became a pilot and flew seaplanes in the Pacific theater. After his service, he returned to Colorado and graduated from the University of Denver with a law degree. He specialized in labor law and workers' rights was one of his lifelong concerns. It prompted him, in fact, to move back to Pueblo, so that he might better understand factory life at the district's mills and plants.

In Pueblo he met his wife Eleanor Trefz, whom he loved dearly. Together they raised four children and nine grandchildren. Mr.

Evans was proud of his family and their accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Frank Evans left a sizable mark on Colorado and there is no doubt his legacy will continue to impact the state. Renaming the Government Printing Office after the Congressman is an appropriate tribute to a man who was central to its construction.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF NATHAN KRUSE ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Nathan Kruse, of Ottawa, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Nathan brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming class of Air Force cadets. While a gifted athlete, having earned varsity and junior varsity letters in football and track, Nathan has also maintained the highest standards of excellence in his academics. He attained a 4.0 GPA at Ottawa-Glandorf High School and is a member of and president of the National Honor Society. Nathan also participated in the German Club, Academic Quiz Bowl and Science Olympiad.

Outside the classroom, Nathan is an Eagle Scout, Junior Optimist Club member and has volunteered for numerous tutoring opportunities. Nathan's dedication and service to his community and his peers has proven his ability to excel among the leaders at the Air Force Academy. I have no doubt that Nathan will take the lessons of his student leadership with him to Colorado Springs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Nathan Kruse on his acceptance of appointment to the United States Air Force Academy where he will gain a world-class education and receive invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Nathan will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PERSONALIZE YOUR CARE ACT OF 2011

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the Personalize Your Care Act of 2011.

Advances in healthcare have led to increasingly complex health care decisions and more treatment options than we have ever before had the benefit—or the burden—of choosing between. Both Democrats and Republicans

agree that individuals should be fully involved in decisions related to their own health care and should be able to make informed decisions about that care reflecting their values and their needs. We also agree that when people have expressed their wishes, particularly in a formal and legally binding manner, those wishes should be known and respected.

While there is widespread agreement regarding these principles, too often this is not the reality. Most adults have not completed an advance directive; if documents are completed, they are not regularly revisited and can be difficult to locate. Because these issues are difficult to discuss, surrogates often feel ill-prepared to interpret their loved ones' written wishes.

These shortcomings can leave families and healthcare proxies faced with the burden of determining their loved ones' wishes in the midst of crisis, sometimes with little or no information about how best to direct care. This adds not only stress and anxiety to an already difficult situation, but studies show that lack of advance care planning actually prolongs the grieving process after losing a loved one.

One of the greatest misconceptions about advance care planning is that it is a one-time event. Attempting to plan for all possibilities in a single document or within a single conversation is overwhelming and, quite likely, impossible. Where possible, this should be an ongoing conversation. Careful, early advance care planning is important because a person's ability to make decisions may diminish over time and he or she may suddenly lose the capability to participate in his or her health care decisions.

Successful advance care planning is less about legal documentation and more about facilitating ongoing communication about future care wishes among individuals, their health care providers, and surrogates. This approach recognizes that advance care documents like advance directives are not the "ends," but the "means"—they are the tools for documenting care preferences based on informed decisions that incorporate an individual's values, personal goals, and current circumstances.

This process not only provides higher quality care, but personalized care.

The Personalize Your Care Act aims to support advance care planning by providing Medicare and Medicaid coverage for voluntary consultations about advance care planning every 5 years or in the event of a change in health status. This periodic revisiting of advance care documents and goals of care recognizes that an individual's preferences can change over time. It also recognizes that the advance care plan should be updated if an individual develops a serious or chronic illness, if additional curative and palliative treatment options become available, and to consistently reflect the individual's current circumstances and preferences.

Honoring the expressed wishes of individuals must also be a priority. For this to occur, advance care planning documents must be accessible wherever care is provided. The legislation ensures that an individual's electronic health record is able to display his or her current advance directive and/or physician orders for life sustaining treatment (POLST), so that his or her wishes are easily accessible and respected. Furthermore, under the legislation, advance directives would be portable, ensuring that advance directives completed in one

state are honored in another state, in the event care needed to be provided there.

The legislation also provides grants to states to establish or expand physician orders for life sustaining treatment programs. These programs have a track record of promoting patient autonomy through documenting and coordinating a person's treatment preferences, clarifying treatment intentions and minimizing confusion, reducing repetitive activities in complying with the Patient Self Determination Act, and facilitating appropriate treatment by emergency personnel.

These investments in advance care planning will reinforce patient-centered care—engaging individuals in planning and decision-making about their future care and ensuring that those preferences are documented, accessible, and can be honored in any state and in any care setting.

I am proud to introduce the Personalize Your Care Act with the support of patient advocates, physicians, nurses, and the faith community who see every day how advance care planning improves individuals' and families' peace of mind and the quality of their care.

TERRORIST ATTACKS ON ISRAELIS MARK NEW ESCALATION

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the recent bombing in Jerusalem and sharp rise in unprovoked rocket attacks from Gaza have marked an escalation in violence by the Palestinian terrorists backed by Hamas and Iran. These attacks are a stark reminder of the constant threat Israel faces from those who want to destroy the Israeli state. It is also a reminder that the friendship and partnership the United States has with Israel is one that must always be protected and enhanced. Israel must be able to count on the continued support of the United States and the American people as they endeavor to live in a democracy free from the threat of attack.

In just the first 3 months of 2011, terrorists have fired more than 150 mortars and rockets into Israel and murdered five members of an Israeli family in their West Bank home. More frightening, Israeli forces intercepted 50 tons of Iranian arms, including advanced anti-ship missiles and radar, 2,500 mortar rounds, and 67,000 AK-47 rounds destined for Hamas in Gaza. The acquisition of these kinds of weapons makes it clear that Palestinian terrorists do not intend to back down from their campaign of terror.

This violence against the Israeli people is aided by the tacit compliance of the Palestinian Authority, which thus far has not stepped up its anti-terrorism efforts to root out Hamas and other terrorist elements associated with the Fatah Party. Instead, the Palestinians are generally accepting of this continued violence, martyring those who kill innocent civilians. Recently, the terrorist Dalal Mughrabi, who killed 35 Israelis after hijacking a bus, had a town square named in his honor. This behavior—and general popular acceptance of terror—only encourages further violence.

We cannot allow this escalated level of violence to be dismissed as just more back and

forth in a protracted conflict between Israel and Palestine. There is never justification for attacks on innocent civilians, and we must demand that the anti-Israel sentiment that pervades Palestine be addressed.

The Israelis remain committed to the peace process, and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has done his part in making concessions that pave the way for substantive talks. This has been met by a refusal by the Palestinians to even recognize Israel's right to exist.

Every sovereign nation has a duty and right to defend its citizens. As a result, the United States must continue to support Israel's right to self-defense. Congress must ensure that the administration does not call on Israel to make concessions that endanger its security without demanding similar changes from the Palestinians. Congress must make clear its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and demand the United Nations enforce a ban on Iranian exports of sophisticated weapons to Hamas and other terrorist groups.

SIDNEY HARMAN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Sidney Harman—a good friend to me and to so many—died at the age of 92. Sidney was the husband of my friend, Congresswoman Jane Harman; he lived a full, rich life, and he will be deeply missed. Sidney was a pioneering entrepreneur in the field of hi-fi stereo systems—but after his business success, he went on to make outstanding contributions to our country's civic life for decades. He was a strong advocate of civil rights who pitched in as a public school teacher; he was Under Secretary of Commerce under President Carter; he was a dynamic philanthropist who made his mark as a patron of education, the arts, and journalism. His many accomplishments, and the admiration of so many who knew him, are certain to long outlive him. But in the wake of his loss, my sincere condolences are with his wife, Congresswoman Harman, his children; and all those who mourn his passing.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, as we debate the House budget resolution today, I ask my colleagues: are you here to make a point, or are you here to make a difference?

We have reached a tipping point in our country's financial future. Our nation is pushed

to the edge of a fiscal cliff. We are over \$14 trillion in debt. CBO projects that the President's budget request will cause net interest payments to skyrocket over the next 10 years—from \$260 billion in 2012 to \$931 billion in 2021. If we continue on our current path, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest payments to service the debt will consume all government revenues within 14 years. We're borrowing 41 cents on every dollar. And we're borrowing from nations such as China and Saudi Arabia that do not share our values or national priorities. Moody's has warned that our coveted AAA bond rating could be at risk in as little as a year. We've seen what a downgrade can do to foreign economies, and we must not let that happen here.

Seeing the signs about our nation's financial future, I introduced legislation almost five years ago—during the last Republican House majority—to create an independent bipartisan commission to address unsustainable federal spending, putting everything on the table for discussion—entitlements, all other spending programs and tax policy—and like the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Commission process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations. An iteration of this legislation became the blueprint for President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, or the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

The President appointed the Bowles-Simpson Commission. He established their working parameters in a manner that, quite frankly, I believed was designed to doom it to failure. Despite this, the report released last December by the commission was supported by a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. It makes clear that addressing the debt and the deficit isn't just a simple exercise in rooting out waste, fraud and abuse, eliminating earmarks, and reining in discretionary spending. Those, to be sure, are important reforms, but alone don't come close to solving the debt and the deficit crisis. Reform must begin with entitlements and other mandatory spending and must also include all other sacred cows, including tax reform and defense spending.

Until two days ago, the President barely acknowledged the work of his commission. He didn't help them assemble the necessary 14 votes to send their recommendations to Congress. Then, he walked away from his commission's recommendations, first by not expressing any views on their report, then silence during the State of the Union, and again silence in his FY 2012 budget request. On Wednesday, the President finally started to recognize the seriousness of this problem. His leadership is needed. But I was disappointed that he failed to offer specific solutions, and seemed more interested in staking out political positions than finding common ground. I hope his call for negotiations across the aisle to develop a legislative framework are successful, but this seems like yet another instance where the President is sidestepping the recommendations of his own fiscal commission.

I believe that the Bowles-Simpson proposal offers the way forward for the most comprehensive and realistic solution to our nation's fiscal problems. I have repeatedly said that, while there are some changes I would make in the plan, if a version of the Bowles-

Simpson plan were given a vote on the House floor, I would vote for it. But we don't have that choice in the House.

My friend JIM COOPER, whom I have partnered with over the past four years to offer a bipartisan way forward to address the nation's financial crisis, initially planned to offer the principals of the Bowles-Simpson proposal as a substitute amendment to be considered today. Recognizing that the President's recent speech has inflamed partisan passions, he withdrew the amendment so as not to undercut efforts underway in the Senate by the so-called Gang of Six. Had the Cooper substitute been offered, I would have voted for it, even though I did not agree with every part of it, such as the reconciliation instructions Mr. COOPER had for the committee of jurisdiction over the federal workforce. I would have voted yes to indicate my continued support for the principals of the Bowles-Simpson commission. Mr. COOPER has engaged in the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we must have, 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 of our children and grandchildren.

I see the Ryan proposal as an honest attempt to provide a blueprint to continue the conversation on our country's financial future and move forward so that a conference with the Senate can produce a budget plan that ensures our national security and protects the programs on which so many Americans rely. The Ryan bill may not pass the Senate, but I commend the chairman of the House Budget Committee for his courage in putting forth a bold proposal to address our nation's skyrocketing and unfunded financial obligations. While his focus is not the "everything on the table" approach I prefer, I believe Mr. RYAN could provide an opening to force both chambers and the President to deal with entitlement spending that is consuming the federal budget. He deserves credit for taking on an issue so many in Congress would rather continue to kick down the road.

It's easy to stand in the well of the House and criticize any legislation. As I look at Chairman RYAN's measure, I don't agree with every provision. I believe there are some critical issues that are missing and things that must be changed, and there are several things that I do not support and will not support if authorizing legislation is offered to implement his budget blueprint.

As I have stated, I believe everything must be on the table for discussion, starting with all entitlement spending, discretionary program spending, and tax policy. But we have reached the moment of truth for the kind of country we will leave to our children and grandchildren. Therefore, I will vote for the Ryan budget so that we can continue to move this process forward and continue the discussion.

This proposal would put our nation on course to reduce all of the publicly held debt by 2060, a feat not reached since Andrew Jackson's presidency. Relative to the President's proposal, it cuts \$6.2 trillion. Under this plan, within four years, we would reach primary balance on our debt, which the President's proposal never attains.

Reaching primary balance, which is when revenue is greater than spending less interest

payments, is an important milestone that reduces a grave national security threat. This budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates, and for repeal of the health care reform law. Significantly, Mr. RYAN's plan says we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN has pulled the curtain back on the mandatory spending elephant in the room that we can no longer ignore.

As I have stated, I will vote for the Ryan budget so that we can move forward to fulfill our responsibility to come up with a budget for this fiscal year. We must avoid the recent fiasco we endured which brought us to the brink of a government shutdown because of the failure by the majority in the last Congress to produce a budget.

That being said, I believe the Ryan budget comes up short in a number of areas. I will mention just a few.

First, it misses an opportunity by not fully addressing the Social Security program's growing deficit. For the first time this year, with the Baby Boom generation starting to retire, more is being paid out in benefits than is coming in. I always ask students whether or not they expect to receive Social Security benefits upon retirement. Three years ago, one or two students would answer in the affirmative. Now, no one does. In calling for Social Security to be on the table, my sole motivation is to protect all those in or near retirement and to ensure that the Social Security program remains strong for future generations. The Ryan budget is lacking here.

Second, the Ryan plan, I believe, unfairly targets the federal workforce. I believe that federal employees know that spending must be reduced to ensure that our country's financial future remains strong, and I believe that public servants would be the first in line to make the sacrifices needed. But the massive budget situation we face, I believe, calls for shared sacrifice that does not single out any one area of the federal budget.

I regret that the Ryan proposal seeks to make government service an unattractive career choice by freezing pay levels, which the President has already frozen for two years, for an additional three years; by imposing drastic hiring restrictions, and by changing retirement plans. Unlike their counterparts in state government, federal employees pay Social Security taxes and contribute to their pensions. The Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund is not facing insolvency.

Federal employees are on the front lines working to ensure that our government is running as efficiently and effectively as possible to provide the services taxpayers expect. We must be careful in budget plans that we first do no harm in our vital efforts to attract, recruit and retain the best and brightest for public service. Day in and day out, federal employees make our nation a safer and better place.

The FBI agent working to find a kidnapped child, the DEA agent keeping drugs out of schools, the DOJ attorney prosecuting a child molester, other law enforcement and intelligence agents risking their lives every day on the front lines side by side with our armed

forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other fronts in the Global War on Terror—all are federal employees. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. Imagine how a CIA employee or an FBI agent working side by side in Afghanistan with the U.S. military would feel knowing that his or her pay would be frozen for five years. A year ago January, I attended funerals for some of the seven CIA agents who were killed by a Taliban suicide bomber at Forward Operative Base Chapman near the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. The Washington Post has reported on "the post 9/11 brain drain at the CIA."

The Border Patrol agent shot and killed in Arizona this past December who was working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants across our southern border, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agent who was killed and the two who were shot this past February outside of Mexico City, doctors who tend to our veterans and wounded warriors in veterans hospitals and who are developing new prosthetic devices to help them recover, medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and autism—all are dedicated federal employees who I'm sure could find more lucrative jobs in the private sector, but who are committed to public service. Dr. Francis Collins, the physician who mapped the human genome and serves as director of the National Institutes of Health, is a federal employee. The National Weather Service meteorologist who tracks hurricanes, the SBA staffer who helps a new business start up, the FDA inspector working to stop a salmonella outbreak—all are federal employees. As we consider ways to find budget savings, it is important to remember the jobs federal employees perform.

The third area in which I believe the Ryan budget could be improved is providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do it in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, "He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord." And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. In Matthew 25 he says that if we ignore the poor and hungry it is the same as ignoring him.

Are we giving false hope to the neediest of our society by refusing to acknowledge that society's safety nets have such gaping holes in their finances that they will collapse within 20 years? We must carefully consider proposals that impact the most vulnerable. The budget before us assumes that program cuts can be absorbed by projecting that unemployment levels will drop to an unheard of 2.8 percent in 10 years. This would be the lowest levels since 1953. I believe this is unrealistic when considering the unemployment rate has historically been 5 percent.

The fourth area of concern with the Ryan budget is its lack of a reform plan to make the tax code fairer and simpler. This budget takes some steps forward, but it could be improved by forcefully calling for a closer examination of tax expenditures, as was detailed by the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

Our colleagues across the Capitol may have the comprehensive Bowles-Simpson plan as a budget choice, and I applaud the efforts of six senators who are working across the aisle to translate this proposal into legislative text. I wholeheartedly support the work of SAXBY

CHAMBLISS, Republican of Georgia; MARK WARNER, Democrat of Virginia; MIKE CRAPO, Republican of Idaho; RICHARD DURBIN, Democrat of Illinois; TOM COBURN, Republican of Oklahoma, and KENT CONRAD, Democrat of North Dakota.

It is disappointing that some have attacked these senators for daring to engage in a discussion putting everything on the table. Regrettably, this seems to be a tried and true technique whenever an attempt to reform the tax code is made.

Senator TOM COBURN is an honest, ethical, decent, member of Congress with whom I served when he was in the House. One of our nation's leading conservative budget hawks, who may have as good, if not a better record than most members of the House and Senate on tax policy, he is currently leading an effort to eliminate one of the more recognizable tax expenditures, the credit given to the producers of ethanol. This is a tax credit that many, such as the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal, think should be eliminated. Ethanol, through tax credits, tariffs, and friendly regulations, is one of the most subsidized industries in the United States. The government has created a perverse policy in which farmers are incentivized to grow corn to produce a "dirty fuel." Food prices rise because this domestic crop does not enter our food supply.

Yet Americans for Tax Reform, led by Grover Norquist, has been engaging in bullying tactics designed to stop Senator COBURN's effort and exert undue influence on this process. This is the same Grover Norquist who, according to Senate Report 109-325, "Gimmie Five—An Investigation of Tribal Lobbying Matters, allowed disgraced and convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff to use ATR as a conduit to finance grassroots lobbying campaigns. When this occurred, ATR kept a cut for itself. Watch the documentary Casino Jack It's all there.

We will never be able to reform the tax code if any attempt to eliminate a tax expenditure—spending through the tax code—is equated to a tax increase. Senator COBURN has called out ATR and Mr. Norquist, pointing out that by this logic, "reducing provisions in the code such as the Earned Income Tax Credit would constitute a violation of your pledge [to oppose tax increases] unless it was 'offset' by another so-called 'tax cut,' such as an expansion of the ethanol subsidy. That is hardly sound conservative economics."

On March 24, the New York Times reported that General Electric, which posted a profit of \$14.2 billion, of which \$5.1 billion came from operations within the United States, did not pay any taxes to the federal government. Not only did they owe nothing to the federal government, they claimed a tax benefit of \$3.2 billion. Many provisions used by their accountants were initially designed as short-term tax breaks to spur economic growth. But as frequently happens, such as with the ethanol subsidy, once a tax cut is enacted, it is nearly impossible to eliminate. If this is not an example of the need to fully reexamine our tax code, I don't know what is. That's why everything in our budget discussion must be on the table.

There is never a convenient time to make hard decisions, but the longer we put off fixing the problem, the worse the medicine will be and greater the number of Americans will be hurt.

America is living on borrowed dollars and borrowed time. As a nation we are moving

closer and closer to the edge of the financial cliff. A few steps forward and we will start a free fall into a canyon of debt which could be the economic death of America as we know it.

Is that what we want for our children and grandchildren?

Have we lost the national will to make tough decisions that may require sacrifice?

Have we lost the political courage to reject the partisan and special interest demands and do what is right for our country?

This is an American issue; not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. I will continue to work to try to achieve balance in our budget plan. Our goal must be a bipartisan document that can pass the House and the Senate. Is the Ryan plan perfect? No. But it at least recognizes the road that we must take. How we get there is the conversation we must continue to have because the financial future for our children and grandchildren is at stake.

I urge my colleagues to heed the wisdom of the father of our country at his farewell address in 1796. President George Washington admonished his fellow countrymen: "We should avoid ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of which we ourselves ought to bear."

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JENNIFER GUZOWSKI ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young woman from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Jennifer Guzowski of Tiffin, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Jennifer brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Tiffin Columbian High School in Tiffin, Ohio, Jennifer earned academic letters and attained a grade point average that placed her in the top fifteen percent of her graduating class. Jennifer was also inducted into the National Honor Society, was a student representative on the school board and held various leadership positions in the school band.

Throughout high school, Jennifer was a member of the junior varsity and varsity soccer teams, displaying her leadership skills as captain of the junior varsity soccer team. She was also awarded a varsity letter for soccer during her senior year and was the recipient of two Golden Shoe Awards. I am confident that Jennifer will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jennifer Guzowski on the acceptance of her appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point where she will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Jennifer will excel during her career in West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the nation.

HONORING COLONEL JACK POTTER

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a loyal friend, a brave hero, and a caring individual who recently turned 92 years young. Retired Colonel Jack Potter of San Rafael California, was born March 20, 1919, served in the Army from World War II through 1974, and has consistently worked for the benefit of veterans since his retirement.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Col. Potter for 18 years. His friendship and assistance have been invaluable to me over those years. Through Jack, I learned about veterans' issues, from the importance of national legislation to ensure they get the benefits they deserve to some of the challenges faced by local vets in Marin County. On Memorial Day, 2008, we authored a column together in the local newspaper calling for better benefits and health treatment for our veterans.

Jack was drafted into the Army in 1941. He was commissioned as an Infantry 2nd Lt. after Pearl Harbor and commanded an Infantry Rifle company seeing combat in the South Pacific. He remained in the Army after the war, serving in Europe, Korea, and South America, as well as in many positions stateside. He also attended The Industrial College of the Armed Forces and earned an MBA at George Washington University.

During the Vietnam conflict, Jack was assigned as the Commander of the Vietnam Region Exchange which operated more than 150 exchange activities with a total of more than 10,000 personnel. He continued his service stateside, in California, where his assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics for the Sixth U.S. Army brought him to the Presidio in the Bay Area. He retired on August 1, 1974, after serving 33 years, 4 months, and 15 days on active duty. On the date of his retirement ceremonies, Jack was testifying in Nebraska in the federal trial of the American Indian Movement. At 12:01 a.m. on August 2, the U.S. Attorney General purchased Jack's first drink as a civilian.

After 31 changes of station, Jack and his wife now live in Marin County, California where Jack became active in veteran's affairs. Serving in various positions in the Military Officers Association of America, and the Marin County United Veterans Council, Jack has been a whirlwind for veterans' causes—he advocated personally for a number of vets who needed help, organized Veterans and Memorial Day events and a Tricare information session with me, and still found time to regularly bring doughnuts to my office staff.

One of Jack's most prominent roles was that of Master of Ceremonies at Marin County's Memorial Day celebrations. He last served that function in 2009, before retiring for health reasons. At that emotional event, 500 people honored Army Spc. Jake Vellozo who had recently been killed in Iraq. Jake's name was added to a veteran's monument that had been built at Jack's urging. And Jack was thrilled to learn that recently the House of Representatives passed my bill to name the local post office in Inverness after Jake Vellozo.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to work with and work for Col. Jack Potter. His quiet

determination on behalf of all veterans is a reminder of the daily heroism and sacrifice of all our troops. Thank you, Jack, for all your efforts.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS WEEK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Crime Victims' Rights Week.

And the month of April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

These two occasions remind us of the importance of educating our fellow citizens about how we can help victims of this terrible crime and how we can stop sexual assault before it happens.

According to the National Institute for Justice and the CDC, every two minutes someone in the United States is sexually assaulted.

And one out of every six women has been the victim of an attempted or completed rape in her lifetime.

As both a prosecutor and a judge back in Texas, I dealt with rape cases for 30 years.

I learned firsthand the devastation sexual assault victims experience.

Sexual Assault does not just physically harm the victim but is an assault on their entire being.

We need to promote justice for sexual assault victims here in Congress and throughout this great nation because justice is what we do in America.

JUSTICE FOR SERGEI MAGNITSKY ACT

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 2009—almost a year and a half ago now—Sergei Magnitsky died in a Russian detention center. While deaths in detention centers do occur all over the world, and the United States is no exception, what sets Mr. Magnitsky's case apart from many of the others are two remarkable facts.

The first remarkable fact is that Mr. Magnitsky was imprisoned not because he had committed a crime, but because he reported one—he just reported it to the wrong people, the very Russian government officials who had orchestrated a massive tax fraud scheme, and continued to report them increasingly louder the more he was threatened by Russian officials to keep quiet.

The second remarkable fact is that with all the necessary medical intervention, his death most likely could have been prevented—but this medical intervention was purposely withheld as punishment. These two facts make Sergei Magnitsky an emblematic victim of much larger human rights problems in the Russian Federation, the utter corruption and the complete lack of the rule of law in that country. This is what makes the Justice for Sergei Magnitsky Act not just an urgent intervention and attempt to establish accountability

in an individual case, but it makes this Act a true Russian Human Rights Act. And I could not be prouder to name the act after this great man, Sergei Magnitsky.

After becoming aware of a massive financial crime, Mr. Magnitsky testified before the official authorities about the largest tax fraud scheme in Russian history. He demonstrated how 230 million dollars were stolen from the Russian Treasury and he implicated a number of public officials who allegedly participated in this scheme. What would be a welcomed treasure of information to any tax fraud investigator in most countries around the world, not so in Russia, where other rules apply. Flying in the face of international legal standards and practices, it was Mr. Magnitsky who found himself arrested and charged with the crimes he helped expose. He was kept in pre-trial detention for almost one year, as the prosecutor's office appeared to have trouble finding any evidence to support their case.

Even more troubling questions relate to Mr. Magnitsky's death. Why did he die, what happened to him? Was he sick? And even then, was he so terribly sick that physicians could not have saved his life? In the absence of a formal and independent investigation into his death, the exact circumstances leading to his death remain shrouded under a veil of government secrecy. What we do know is that when Mr. Magnitsky was sent to prison, he was in general good health and showed no signs of medical problems.

We also know that Mr. Magnitsky—who diligently kept a record of his treatment in prison—was denied urgent medical care when he requested it from his captors, who were aware of his medical needs and deteriorating health.

Many of those unanswered questions deserve an answer—Mr. Magnitsky's family deserves an answer, as do the Russian people. Many of my colleagues and friends in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, and in both chambers, would like to see these questions answered. European Members of Parliament would like to see these questions answered. Russian human rights defenders would like to see these questions answered.

Up until now, no serious investigation into these matters has been undertaken, and most worrisome, no one has been held accountable. Not for the fraud, not for the abuse, not for the death.

Mr. Speaker, Sergei Magnitsky was a remarkable person, although he would certainly have disputed this claim. He was a husband, and a father of two children; he was a hard-working attorney; he was trying to provide for his family, a friendly and caring man, like many ordinary citizens in Russia.

What was special about Sergei was that in the face of threats, he had the courage to stand up for what is right. Sergei Magnitsky was special, because he was undeterred in the face of an enormous state apparatus that only served the interests of those people whom he had implicated. Consequently, the state arrested him and detained him for almost one year without bringing any charges. The prosecutor used his imprisonment to soften him up; to make him change or retract his testimony—and when he refused, he paid the ultimate price.

For his contributions to the fight against corruption in Russia, Mr. Magnitsky posthumously received the Transparency International Integrity reward 2009–2010. I quote the chair of the

awards committee who said “He [Mr. Magnitsky] believed in the rule of law and integrity, and died for his belief. Sergei, his heroic fight, and the ideals he stood for must never be forgotten.”

Mr. Speaker, all too often have the deaths of critics or whistleblowers of the Russian regime been swept under the carpet in Russia—Anna Politkovskaya and Natalia Estemirova are just two such famous examples of brave Russians who have died in search of truth. Now, Sergei Magnitsky's name will be added to this illustrious list of brave individuals.

Mr. Speaker, Russia has ratified numerous international human rights treaties. These include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention against Torture and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Russian Federation is also a contracting party to the European Convention on Human Rights and has subjected itself to the jurisdiction of the European Court on Human Rights, where it is all too frequently a defendant.

These internationally incurred obligations are binding. When Russia signed those treaties it made a public pledge—with the world as its witness—to uphold the inalienable rights enshrined in those very documents. But Russia not only signed a contract with the global community; but first and foremost, Russia signed a contract with its own people, these international commitments are a public expression of the Federation's desire to protect the individual rights of the Russian people.

If we do not want these human rights treaties to become hollow documents, if we want to maintain an international legal order in which these documents have any meaning at all, we need to speak up and demand that they be observed. What is the use of these treaties, when states can choose to ignore them at will; when they get in the way; when they find them inconvenient? Are we to allow that the signing of human rights treaties becomes a purely cosmetic action? No. I do not think so. I will not stand for that.

But Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. It is not only the formality of observing the treaty that matters. My primary concern is with the content of these documents, for what they represent. They say no to torture and abuse. They say no to arbitrary detention. They say no to murder, either actively or through utter medical neglect. They demand that people are protected from the abuse of the state. They promise that people are treated with dignity.

We need to be candid and frank with our friends and allies. We need to be able to look each other in the eyes and tell the truth. We need to question one another, and call each other out. That is what you do when you are a member of a larger society. For when we fail to do so, we have truly lost touch; we resign to our faith and show we care no longer. Russia, as a most important member of the family of nations, can do better and should do better than that.

I am not alone in this criticism. Senator CARDIN has voiced his concern about Sergei's abuse and death. And most recently during a visit to Moscow on March 10, 2011, Vice President BIDEN also criticized Russia: “a country in which—a company which can be seized, or an owner imprisoned on a politician's whim; in which a lawyer like Sergei Magnitsky [. . .] can be arrested after accusing the police of fraud and then die in deten-

tion before being tried”. He went on to say “We will continue to object when we think human rights are violated or democracy and the rule of law are undermined.”

I could not agree more with this statement, Mr. Speaker. And it is to reinforce this message, a message that asks Russia to stop these human rights abuses, to reform their justice system, to address their prison conditions, and to root out corruption and the abuse of power, that I have introduced legislation. I am deeply grateful to Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS, FRANK WOLF, JOSEPH PITTS, SUE MYRICK, STEVE COHEN and CHRIS SMITH, for their strong support and input.

The bill I introduced today imposes travel bans and financial sanctions on those involved in the fraud scheme and Mr. Magnitsky's abuse and death in prison. The bill further will fully restore if possible what is rightfully the property of the Russian people. By targeting the Russian Treasury, this fraud was committed against all Russian people; they are the true owners of the stolen 5.4 billion rubles.

ALAMOSA COOLSUNSHINE
WRESTLING TEAM TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the participants of the 2011 Rocky Mountain Nationals Youth Wrestling Tournament in Denver, Colorado. As in the Colorado State High School Tournament, the San Luis Valley was well represented and enjoyed immense success.

Known for its high degree of difficulty, the Tournament can be one of the most challenging in the area. That reputation underscores the accomplishments of the wrestlers from the San Luis Valley. Three members of the Alamosa Coolsunshine Team placed in the top five for their respective weight divisions, most notably Isaiah DeLaCerde who grabbed second place in the 82 pound 12 & Under Bracket. Dozens of other wrestlers from southern Colorado also placed, including Dante Martinez, Michael Valdez and Austin Vance of Monte Vista.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the success grapplers from around Colorado enjoyed in the Rocky Mountain Nationals Youth Wrestling Tournament. There is no doubt they will continue to represent their community admirably for many years.

HONORING WESLEY HENRY
SCHERLER McDOWELL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Wesley Henry Scherler McDowell. Wesley is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 175, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Wesley has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Wesley has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Wesley has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Wesley scraped, painted and replaced the floor molding in the front entryway and men's bathroom for St. Rita's school at St. Munchin in Cameron, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Wesley Henry Scherler McDowell for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MRS. PAT
STELLA

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Pat Stella, a recipient of the 2011 Volunteers of America Pennsylvania's Spirit of Youth award.

The Spirit of Youth award is given to those who instill hope and belief in the advancement of all. Their support of the community and of Volunteers of America ranges from helping children to helping those who are young at heart. Pat has dedicated herself to doing just that through her business and volunteer efforts.

Pat Stella is the owner and operator of 11 McDonald's restaurants throughout Luzerne, Carbon, Lackawanna, and Wayne counties in Pennsylvania. Growing up in Chicago, Pat's mother started working as a secretary in the McDonald's corporate office. Her family moved to Pennsylvania after selling everything they had to buy a McDonald's franchise. Pat, a former elementary school teacher, began working for McDonald's when her family opened a second restaurant more than 30 years ago. She became the owner-operator of the enterprise in 1980.

Pat's work ethic and service has been recognized in many ways. In 2003, Pat received the McDonald's Street Fighter Award for her superior marketing and business sales. She has also received the Women Operators' Network 2003 Shining Star Award. Most notably, Pat earned the highest award a McDonald's owner can receive, the Golden Arch Award.

Pat not only dedicates herself to her work, but she also dedicates herself to her husband and three children, and to her community. In addition to working with Volunteers of America, Pat serves on the boards of the Pittston Chamber of Commerce and Scranton's Ronald McDonald House. She is a past member of McDonald's National Operators Advisory Board and its Steering Committee, and she has served as the co-chair of the Philadelphia McDonald's Owner/Operator Association.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Stella's work ethic is not the only trait to make her stand out in our community. Pat's service to our area has touched many lives. Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mrs. Pat Stella, a recipient of this year's Vol-

unteers of America Pennsylvania's Spirit of Youth award.

GOD'S CHILD PROJECT 20TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICK BERG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize the 20th anniversary of the God's Child Project, a North Dakota-based program to combat international human trafficking.

Human trafficking is among the largest criminal industries in the world, second only to the illegal drug trade.

It is also the fastest growing, with an estimated 12 million people enslaved worldwide—including many in the United States.

God's Child Project has been providing education, medical care, and other critical aid to children and families around the world since 1991.

For the past 10 years, this non-profit has worked with an affiliate in Guatemala to combat international human trafficking and exploitation.

This month, as the program celebrates its 20th anniversary, I want to commend the good and selfless work being done through God's Child Project.

I am proud that this program has given so much to help the victims of human trafficking, and I'm happy that the program is able to call North Dakota home.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MATTHEW SLOCUM ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Matthew Slocum of Perrysburg, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, New York.

Matthew brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Perrysburg High School in Perrysburg, Ohio, Matthew consistently achieved honor roll. Matthew involved himself in a number of athletic activities, including football and baseball, in which he earned varsity letters. He also served as a volunteer at youth football and baseball camps.

On top of this, he excelled academically and served his church on its Youth Leadership Committee.

I am confident that Matthew will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Matthew Slocum on the ac-

ceptance of his appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy where he will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Matthew will excel during his career at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the nation.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAS HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL TEAM

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of the Americas High School Mock Trial team from my congressional district in El Paso, Texas. On March 5, 2011, at the Texas High School Mock Trial Competition, the Americas High School Mock Trial team became the first team from El Paso in the competition's 32-year history to win the Texas state title. This is a remarkable achievement that I am proud to recognize.

Mock Trial offers students across the nation the opportunity to develop critical thinking and public speaking skills, as well as knowledge of legal practices and procedures, in a real courtroom setting. Teams devote long hours to work on case theories and examinations to prepare for competition.

Undeclared in the regional competition for three years in a row, the Americas High School Mock Trial team's dedication secured their victory as they defeated the defending state champions. The team members include Enrique Esparza, Edwin Felix, Zach Fields, Joshua Monarez, Nayell Palomino, Jacob Parson, Texas Quezada, Chris Ramos, Savannah Rappe, and Anabella Tarango. In addition to the team victory, Zach Fields was awarded the Outstanding Advocate Award at the competition in a unanimous decision by the judges.

The Americas High School Mock Trial team is coached by Mr. Robert Almonte II, Assistant City Attorney for the City of El Paso, and Mr. Jaime Esparza, the District Attorney for the 34th Judicial District of Texas. The team's teacher sponsor, Teresa Candelaria, has served as their sponsor for seven seasons since 2004. I commend these three outstanding professionals for their dedication to the educational development of El Paso students.

Americas High School, located in east El Paso, is one of seven high schools in the Socorro Independent School District. The school opened in September 1996, serving a predominantly Hispanic student population.

In early May, the Americas High School Mock Trial team will travel to Phoenix, Arizona, to represent the State of Texas at the National High School Mock Trial Championship. I am pleased to honor this team for their impressive accomplishments, and wish all team members the very best in their future endeavors.

REFLECTS ON THE 100th ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRIANGLE FIRE

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, from Wisconsin to Washington, we are at a crossroads right now about the kind of America we want to be. At this important moment, it would do us well to reflect on our shared past, when our nation reached a similar crossroads—after the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire, one of the worst industrial accidents in American history, which occurred a century ago last month.

I say “accident,” but really there was more at work here. If you do not know the story, the Triangle Fire resulted in the death of 146 garment workers—17 men and 129 women—most of them young immigrant women under the age of 25. In the months before the fire—until they successfully struck for shorter hours and better pay—they had been working 13-hour days, and getting paid 13 cents an hour.

The fire happened in a garment factory that took up the eighth, ninth, and tenth floors of a New York City building, one with poor ventilation and no real safety measures in place. When the fire started, likely due to a cigarette or match, the owners of the Triangle Company were notified by phone and escaped.

But nobody told the workers. And so, when the fire began to rage, these women could not get out. Fire blocked many of the exits, and one of the main stairways had been locked shut by the Triangle Company—the foreman with the key had also left. And so many women tried to escape by jumping to their deaths. Those who did not leap burned.

The Triangle Fire was a nightmare that unfolded before the entire nation. Because of this tragedy, church leaders called for a renewed commitment to the principles of social justice, known as the Social Gospel. And a generation of progressives was moved to reform. Within three years, 36 new state laws passed to regulate fire safety and workplace safety, and New York became a model for the nation.

Because of the Triangle Fire, all of America saw firsthand what happens when women and workers are left without basic protections. And we as a people realized that government has an important role to play in ensuring the life, health, and dignity of workers.

That is why I am concerned about the many attempts by the majority to cut basic protections, or to see the assaults on employees’ rights taking place in states like Wisconsin and Ohio. We know where all of this leads—Our nation has lived it, a century ago.

Before us are two different visions of America. I know which I want to live in, and which I want to strive for.

HONORING THE LIFE OF VIRGINIA BRAUN

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Virginia Bradley Braun—

a philanthropist, a civic leader, a proud Californian, and a patriot. She was very active in politics and a long-time friend and supporter of Governor and President Ronald Reagan. It was a privilege to call her a friend as well.

GINIE, as she was known to all, contributed enormously to her adopted home in the greater Los Angeles area. Like me, Ginie grew up a Midwesterner, then came to California at a young age, and quickly called it home.

She and her husband Henry gave generously to the community, supporting a vast array of worthy causes, from education to the arts to children’s health. But Ginie was most generous with her time. She spent a lifetime volunteering for civic organizations, political causes, and charities that helped to improve the lives of those who shared her community.

One of her most dedicated endeavors was her support for Pepperdine University, a tremendous institution that has served Southern California since 1937. Ginie joined the Pepperdine University Board in 1983 and was named to the University’s Board of Regents in 1995. Her legacy lives on in the Henry A. and Virginia B. Braun Center for Public Policy, which was dedicated in 2003. The Braun Center will continue to advance the academic excellence to which Ginie was so devoted.

But Ginie’s greatest generosity to the university was reserved for institutions and programs that did not bear her name. From athletics to arts, Ginie was a very proud supporter of Pepperdine, its facilities, its faculty and its students.

As University President Andrew Benton said, “Ginie radiated life.” Her energy and charisma were irrepressible. She brought them to every one of her life’s endeavors, and inspired those around her with her love of life and generosity of spirit. I know that I am joined by countless others in celebrating the tremendous life of Ginie Braun.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. AND MRS. JOHN AND TINA DOWD

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Mr. and Mrs. John and Tina Dowd, recipients of the 2011 Volunteers of America Pennsylvania’s Spirit of Youth award.

The Spirit of Youth award is given to those who instill hope and belief in the advancement of all. Their support of the community and of Volunteers of America ranges from helping children to helping those who are young at heart. John and Tina Dowd exemplify these traits, and have used their own lives to help others.

John Dowd grew up in Sunbury, Pennsylvania. He attended Shikellamy High School before studying engineering at the Pennsylvania State University. John is the president of Sundance Vacations, which he grew from one small office in Pocono Lake, Pennsylvania, into a national company that was named one of the Inc 500 fastest-growing companies two years in a row. As he grew his business, he also dedicated himself to giving back to his community. In addition to his work with Volunteers of America, John donates to the Luzerne

Foundation and the Wyoming Valley Children’s Association. His company sponsors local Little League and booster club sports teams, and he participates in many other local and national charitable causes.

Tina Dowd co-founded Sundance Vacations with her husband, John. Tina is a graduate of Kutztown University of Pennsylvania. She has been an integral part of growing the business. In November 2010, Tina accepted the Employer of the Year Award at the seventh annual Stevie Awards for Women in Business. In addition to managing and training employees, Tina oversees all of the firm’s communications. John and Tina spend a lot of time with their three daughters, but like her husband, Tina volunteers for many organizations. Tina serves as vice president of an organization serving homeless children and their families in Carbon County—an organization she helped found. She is a member of the Lehigh Area School District Board of Directors, the Community Action Council of Palmerton Area Churches, and the Luzerne Foundation Millennium Circle. She is a past board member of the Northeast Pennsylvania Better Business Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Dowd have not only grown a business that employs more than 700 people, but they have used their talents to give back to the community they love so much. Their philanthropic efforts and volunteerism have helped so many of our neighbors. John and Tina are extraordinary both as a couple and as individuals. Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating John and Tina Dowd, recipients of this year’s Volunteers of America Pennsylvania’s Spirit of Youth award.

RETIREMENT OF LAUSD SUPER-INTENDENT RAMON CORTINES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished 55-year career of Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Superintendent Ramon Cortines.

Superintendent Cortines began his career as an educator in 1956, teaching a class of 44 sixth graders, in Aptos, California. He taught at the elementary, middle and high school levels before becoming a school administrator and ultimately serving as Superintendent of Schools in Pasadena, San Jose, San Francisco, New York City and Los Angeles.

Superintendent Cortines is one of our nation’s most experienced educators. He has advised every President or his Education Secretary since the Carter Administration, and in 1992 he chaired the Department of Education transition team for President Clinton. Cortines served as Superintendent of LAUSD briefly in 2000 and returned to the position in 2008, during which time he steered the district through unprecedented fiscal challenges while improving pupil attendance, school safety and student achievement.

Upon his retirement today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished career of this dedicated public servant.

HONORING STUDENT VETERAN
AND COMMUNITY LEADER MATT
RANDLE

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize former United States Army Combat Medic and current University of Arizona student Matt Randle.

Over the course of his career in the Army, Matt received two Army Commendation Medals, three Army Achievement Medals and two Good Conduct Medals for his service.

Following his distinguished service to our country Matt returned to his hometown of Tucson, Arizona and enrolled at the University of Arizona. Once on the UA campus, Matt began working with UA President Robert Shelton and his staff to develop and implement a program to support returning veterans attending the University. I am proud to say that today the University of Arizona, located in my Congressional district, has one of the most progressive and impressive veteran education and service models in the country including a student run veteran's office.

Matt's leadership has also played an integral role in the prosperity of the UA Veterans club. This club received numerous awards on the University of Arizona's campus including the Club of the Year and Philanthropic Group of the Year for the 2009–2010 academic school year. The Student Veterans of America also recognized the club nationally, awarding it the "Club of the Year Award."

This year Matt will receive the UA's 2011 Robie Award. The award is issued to students who show personal integrity, initiative, cooperativeness, enthusiasm, humility, patriotism, well-rounded interests, active participation in student affairs and a commitment to service. Matt Randle is a model candidate for this award.

Matt Randle's ambition and leadership both at the UA and nationally will certainly be of great benefit to our returning veterans. Every day more veterans return home from the Middle East conflicts. The programs that Matt built on the University of Arizona campus support these men and women as they transition back to civilian life.

Upon graduation Matt will be attending the University Of Arizona Rogers College of Law in the fall of 2011.

I am pleased to acknowledge my constituent and friend, Matt Randle. I thank him for his leadership, service and outstanding contributions to the University and our community.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND
FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Continuing Resolution. We must pass this bill today to begin to get this Nation on a path of fiscal stability. I want to make a

few brief remarks about the State-Foreign Operations title of the bill. State-Foreign Operations is reduced by 8.4 billion dollars from the fiscal year 2011 request. While some of my colleagues might say these funding levels mean that diplomacy and development take a large reduction, we need to keep in mind that the State-Foreign Operations bill grew by more than 33% from FY08 to FY10. We simply cannot allow these programs to continue to grow at this rate. The reductions taken in this bill are targeted, so that we can remain focused on our highest national security priorities. The bill provides critical funds for the frontline States of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. It supports security assistance to some of our strongest allies—like Israel, Jordan, Mexico, and Colombia. It also addresses unexpected humanitarian crises around the world. I want to thank my colleague, Ranking Member Lowey, for working with me to address these high priority needs. I know we will continue to work together to address problems of bipartisan concern.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ASHTON GENZMAN ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young woman from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Ashton Genzman of Perrysburg, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Ashton brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. She has served in several leadership roles: student government, Junior Induction Committee, Culinary Club and in a variety of other groups and extracurricular activities. While attending Notre Dame Academy in Toledo, Ohio, Ashton consistently achieved high honors, with an exceptional grade point average.

Throughout high school, Ashton participated in a number of athletic activities, including tennis, in which she received a varsity letter. She has also been involved in crew and track and field. I am confident that Ashton will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the United States Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ashton Genzman on the acceptance of her appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, where she will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Ashton will excel during her career at the United States Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "VET-
ERANS HOME LOAN IMPROVE-
MENT ACT"

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the bipartisan "Veterans Home Loan Improvement Act of 2011" along with Reps. TAMMY BALDWIN, BRIAN BILBRAY, SUSAN DAVIS, PETER DEFAZIO, BOB FILNER, JOHN GARAMENDI, AL GREEN, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, KURT SCHRADER, GREG WALDEN, DAVID WU, and DON YOUNG. Together we represent each of the states that would benefit from an expansion of the Qualified Veterans Mortgage Bond program.

This program was originally created after World War II to promote homeownership among our returning troops. Together, our states offer veterans mortgage loans at more favorable interest rates as a reward for their service to our Nation. As part of a comprehensive review of veterans' services in the state of Oregon, the Oregon Governor's Veterans Task Force recommended a further expansion of this highly effective program.

This Act is based on one particularly timely recommendation to expand eligibility for our state programs and bring affordable mortgages to an additional 264,000 veterans. I look forward to continuing to work on behalf of Oregon and the nation's veterans to ensure that we provide the best possible quality of care and service, and so that we can make this a true lifetime benefit for all qualified veterans.

96TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the record these remarks I gave at a Capitol Hill ceremony commemorating the 96th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

Tonight we commemorate a truly unjust and tragic chapter in human history—and just as importantly, we acknowledge that chapter as an historic fact. From 1915 to 1923, officials of the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic campaign of massacres and forced deportations of Armenians from their historic homeland. In the end, this genocide cost the lives of one and a half million murdered men, women, and children. Another half million lost their homes.

In a July 24, 1915 cable, American Consul Leslie Davis said of the genocide, "I do not believe there has ever been a massacre in the history of the world so general and thorough as that which is now being perpetrated in this region or that a more fiendish, diabolical scheme has ever been conceived by the mind of man."

We commemorate the 20th century's first genocide not only to honor the lives of the dead, but because its effects are still very much with us. The Armenian Genocide has been a terrifying inspiration for mass murderers from Cambodia to Rwanda to the

former Yugoslavia to Darfur. As early as 1897, a French Jew named Bernard Lazare reflected on the massacres of Armenians that had already taken place and speculated that the Jew-haters of Europe might one day turn to an "Armenian solution" of their own. Four decades later—the Holocaust.

At the same time, the Armenian Genocide reminds us of our collective responsibility in the face of such crimes. In fact, it was in a statement from the Allied Powers denouncing the massacres that the phrase "crime against humanity" first appeared. The Armenian Genocide helped set a precedent that a murderous crime against a minority is a crime against us all—that there is a collective responsibility to prevent genocide.

That precedent and that responsibility came too late to save 1.5 million Armenians—along with all those killed in genocides that stopped too late. We have lived up to the responsibility first formulated in the wake of the Armenian Genocide all too imperfectly. But may this commemoration remind us of that responsibility—as the United Nations Genocide Convention tells us, a responsibility not only to address genocide after the fact, but to prevent it. We have a responsibility for action, not apathy: action to end crimes against humanity and punish the perpetrators.

We share the same goal: seeing the truth of the Armenian Genocide recognized by Congress. I hope to see a bill recognizing the genocide pass, and I wish that had happened in December. Unfortunately, by our count, the votes were not there—and in our opinion, a loss would have been a set-back cheered by genocide deniers. But I applaud the work you to do preserve the memory and the lessons of this historic truth. And I believe the day will come when Congress recognizes that truth, as well. You can count on my vote.

The evil of the first recognized crime against humanity can never be undone, and the dead cannot be restored to their families and their homeland. But may the memory of their lives inspire us to speak out and take action against crimes against humanity in our own time, and to pursue the justice that was denied to those 1.5 million.

REMEMBERING ROBERT W. WELLER

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness to honor the passing of a dear friend, Bob Weller.

Bob was a retired certified public accountant who was a managing partner of the George S. Olive & Company's Richmond office in my district. Bob began his distinguished career with George S. Olive, now BKD LLC CPAs and Advisors, in Indianapolis in 1950, and he later moved to Richmond with his wife, Margie, and their young family to open a new office. He went on to serve as the managing partner there for thirty years.

But Bob was more than just a working man; he was a community man. He gave freely of his time and resources to benefit those around him. Bob served as President of the Wayne County Chamber of Commerce, President of

the Boys Club, and President of Green Acres (now Achieva). During his time at the Chamber, he was instrumental in leading efforts to rebuild Richmond, Indiana, following a devastating double explosion in 1968.

Some of Bob's other involvements included the Forest Hills Country Club, Kiwanis International, Reid Memorial Presbyterian Church, Central United Methodist Church, and the Indiana University Alumni Association. Like many Hoosiers, Bob was an avid Indiana University basketball and football fan, and he greatly enjoyed fishing, hunting, traveling, and spending time with his family.

I give my sincere condolences to Bob's loving wife of 62 years, Margie Walraven Weller; his sister Laverne; his three children Marcia Enslin, Robert Weller Jr., Mark Weller and their spouses; and his seven grandchildren. May I offer the Lord's comfort that we find in the Good Book that "Because of the Lord's great love we are not consumed, for his compassions never fail."

HONORING MR. ABRAHAM BREEHEY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of my friend Abraham Breehey, who passed away yesterday at the young age of 35.

Abe was a champion for working men and women throughout his career. As Legislative Director for the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Abe was a leader among his colleagues representing the building and construction trades. He fought for labor and economic policies that would promote a fairer economy, and was an early leader in making the case that an energy policy to combat climate change would also be economically beneficial to those who, like boilermakers, are engaged in energy production.

I got to know Abe before coming to Congress. We served together in Albany, where I was a Member of the New York State Assembly and Abe was a legislative aide to my Western New York colleague Sam Hoyt. We bonded over our shared love of music, and Abe gave me my first lessons on the guitar, a fact he never grew tired of reminding me about.

Abe's life was tragically cut short, a victim of brain cancer. He leaves behind a wife and daughter. He had much more left to give the people he fought for, but he had already given so much. His advocacy will be missed by the labor movement, and his warm heart will be missed by his friends.

For my part, I will honor Abe by drawing inspiration from his work on behalf of those working in the building trades, and by redoubling my commitment to support cancer research.

Abe was a gentleman, a professional, an optimist and a good, kind friend. He is missed.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CREATING REAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROSPERITY (CROP) ACT

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that greatly affects agricultural employment in my district and across the country. Against the backdrop of a beleaguered economy still recovering from the recession many small community banks have been unable to extend loans to farmers. Credit is needed to hire new employees, purchase seed, fertilizer, and fuel, all of which creates economic opportunity and subsequently produces jobs. The Farm Service Administration in the United States Department of Agriculture makes direct loans and loan guarantees to farmers who cannot qualify for regular credit. These loans allow farmers to continue growing rural economies and producing a safe and secure food supply.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 1992 provided banking institutions to extend credit to farmers for a 15 year period. During the 111th Congress, the extension of term limits was allowed to expire on December 31, 2010, leaving family farmers without the ability to receive much needed operating loans to run the farm and hire employees. That is a why I am proud to introduce the Creating Real Opportunities for Prosperity Act, otherwise known as the CROP Act, which suspends the term limits and extends the period for guaranteed credit to December 13, 2013. This will provide much needed access to loans for farmers.

Farm operating loan term limits will be addressed by the next Farm Bill and this suspension of term limits will allow the members of the House Committee on Agriculture to determine what solution or changes need to be made while providing the security for community banks and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the CROP Act and bring stability to rural economies.

THE PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF LEARN AND SERVE

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed elimination of Learn and Serve America, the only Federal program dedicated to investing in service-learning in local schools and communities, in this budget. This decision is reckless and short-sighted, and I do not believe it reflects our values as a nation.

We live in a world full of challenges that require the collective attention and action of citizens of all ages. Through service-learning, young people across the country learn to apply knowledge and skills they pick up in the classroom to address these challenges in their community. Thanks to Learn and Serve, students have conducted energy audits in their

schools and homes, preserved the histories of their towns, tested the quality of water in local streams, refurbished homes of the elderly, confronted bullying and teen violence, promoted financial literacy, and helped communities prepare for disasters.

By getting involved in the community in this manner, students not only learn valuable citizenship skills, they learn to succeed. Research has shown that service-learning increased academic engagement and civic engagement. It prepares young men and women for the transition to adulthood and gives them the skills they need to succeed in the careers of their choosing.

Service, citizenship, community, opportunity—these are all values we treasure as a Nation, and values our budget should work to promote. That is one of the many reasons why I have been a longtime supporter of the Summer of Service, which works to increase the number of intensive summer service-learning programs for middle school youth. And yet, this budget resolution eliminates support for service-learning, and abolishes a clear pathway for youth under age 16 to engage as participants in national service.

As a result of this short-sighted cut, nearly 1 million students will lose the opportunity to take part in service-learning. At a time when State and local budgets are shrinking, nearly 600 individual schools, 450 school districts, 985 community colleges, and 240 colleges and universities—as well as 35,000 of our nation's most innovative K–12 teachers and higher education faculty—will lose desperately needed funding. Almost 16,000 community-based organizations will lose more than 14 million volunteer service hours provided by students engaged in service-learning, diminishing their capacity to deliver urgently needed health and human services to those most in need. And towns and cities across the country will lose access to student volunteers, who contribute services valued at up to \$310 million.

In short, this cut is penny-wise and pound-foolish. I urge the administration to encourage the Corporation for National and Community Service to identify cost savings and provide a competitive innovation fund for high impact service-learning programs. Our students cannot afford to lose these opportunities. Our schools cannot afford to ignore their civic mission. Our local communities cannot afford to lose the critical support. And our future as a nation cannot afford to lose these values of citizenship.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WAYNE
GRISHAM

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, Wayne Grisham was a business leader and a public servant who spent a lifetime enriching the communities of the San Gabriel Valley and the Gateway Cities. As a La Mirada city councilman, a California assemblyman and a U.S. Congressman, he brought civility and good humor to his public service. As a small businessman, he contributed to the entrepreneurial spirit that forms the backbone of the Southern California

economy. He is greatly missed by all who had the pleasure of knowing him and serving with him.

In the 1982 Congressional election, Wayne and I had the misfortune of finding our districts drawn together. No elected representative hopes to face one of his own colleagues in a primary election, but I will never forget the civility with which Wayne conducted himself when we found ourselves in those unexpected circumstances. While we engaged in a very rigorous campaign, Wayne was always a true gentleman. That election exemplified the strength of character for which Wayne has always been known.

Before Wayne served his community as an elected representative, he served his country in World War II with honor and distinction. As a fighter pilot his plane was shot down over Germany, where he became a prisoner of war. When he returned home, he was recognized with a Purple Heart.

Wayne continued to serve his country not only through elected office, but as director of the Peace Corps in Kenya. He was appointed by President Reagan to this post in 1983.

I was very saddened by the news of his passing, but I count it a privilege to have served with him and I join his family and friends to honor the life of Wayne Grisham.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE WOMEN'S RESOURCE CENTER DURING SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Women's Resource Center at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) for highlighting Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

It is reported that worldwide, one out of every three women will be physically abused during her lifetime. In the United States, nearly two million women are assaulted each year, and more than half of all women will be physically assaulted during their lifetime. Last year in Texas, there were over 15,000 pending cases involving sexual assault or indecency with a child. In El Paso alone, there were over 850 pending cases reported.

These numbers indicate the severity of a widespread problem that can have devastating social and health-related consequences. To highlight the problem of violence against women and to support the survivors of sexual violence, the Women's Resource Center at UTEP, in collaboration with the Take Back the Night Foundation, will be one of ten partners throughout the nation that will participate in the second annual 10 Points of Light to Take Back the Night initiative on April 28th. This national initiative has assembled community organizers, campus advocates, and student leaders to illuminate the darkness of abuse, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

Take Back the Night is a powerful movement that started in the 1970s to combat sexual violence and abuse on campuses and in communities around the world. The UTEP Women's Resource Center provides supportive services for students, faculty, staff, and administrators at the university.

Today, I am proud to recognize the Women's Resource Center at UTEP, the Take Back the Night Foundation, and everyone who is helping with this important initiative. As a husband, father, and grandfather, I am proud to lend my voice to this effort. I encourage all Americans to raise awareness of sexual assault in our nation and help empower individuals to "end the silence and stop the violence."

COMMEMORATING NISEI FARMERS LEAGUE'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and my colleagues the Majority Whip (Mr. MCCARTHY) and the Gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), to extend my congratulations to Nisei Farmers League as they celebrate their 40th anniversary on April 16, 2011.

Farming in the San Joaquin Valley witnessed dramatic changes in the 1960s and 1970s. A small group of Japanese-American growers met near Fresno to discuss the need to unify growers and establish a robust network to protect their rights and property. As more growers joined the group, the Nisei Farmers League was established, taking its name "Nisei" from the term for second-generation Japanese-Americans.

Today, the Nisei Farmers League works to keep its members informed on important issues and is a strong voice for valley growers. Together with my colleagues, I recognize the commitment the Nisei Farmers League has provided to its members for 40 years.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION WELCOMING THE NEW STATE OF SOUTHERN SUDAN, ENCOURAGING SUDAN AND SOUTHERN SUDAN TO RESOLVE SEPARATION ISSUES AND THE FUTURE OF THE ABYEI REGION, AND URGING THE GOVERNMENTS OF SUDAN AND SOUTHERN SUDAN TO ABIDE BY THE PRINCIPLES OF PEACE, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution welcoming the new state of Southern Sudan, encouraging Sudan and Southern Sudan to resolve separation issues and the future of the Abyei region, and urging the Governments of Sudan and Southern Sudan to abide by the principles of peace, democracy, and human rights.

Sudan is geographically the largest country in Africa and one of the least developed regions of the world. Sudan has been ravaged by civil war intermittently for four decades and ethnic, religious, and economic conflicts have ensued between the Muslim north and Christian-animist south. These past twenty years,

an estimated two million people have died and four million people have been displaced. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), signed in January 2005, put an end to the long-lasting conflict between the north and the south by establishing a semi-autonomous government for Southern Sudan for a duration of six years, after which Southern Sudan would vote for secession or unity.

From January 9 to 15, 2011, Sudan held a referendum to decide if Southern Sudan would become a sovereign and independent country, or remain part of Sudan. Approximately 3.8 million Southern Sudanese exercised their right to self determination, and on February 7, 2011, the Southern Sudan Referendum Commission (SSRC) announced the final results, with almost 99 percent voting for independence from the north.

On February 7, 2011, Sudan's President Omar Al-Bashir officially accepted the final results of the referendum, and the United States announced on the same day its intention to formally recognize Southern Sudan. On July 9, 2011, Southern Sudan will become the sovereign and independent Republic of Southern Sudan.

While I applaud these recent accomplishments, several issues pertaining to the separation of the two states remain and must be resolved prior to the conclusion of the transition period. These include and are not limited to: the legal status of populations in the north and south, wealth sharing, resource management—especially oil revenues, division of assets and debt, currency, security arrangements, and infrastructure and institutions building. The future status of the oil rich region of Abyei—full integration with Sudan or Southern Sudan, or partition of the region in two—also needs to be determined.

My resolution congratulates the people of Southern Sudan for exercising their right to self determination and welcomes the new nation of Southern Sudan. In addition, it calls on both parties to resolve separation issues prior to the conclusion of the transition period, including the status of Abyei. It also urges Sudan to put an end to repression and violence, and Southern Sudan to create democratic institutions and plan elections. Lastly, the resolution pledges that the United States will work with both governments to ensure a peaceful transition to independence and encourages other nations to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has played a major role in bringing this devastating conflict to an end. I will continue to monitor the issue and advocate for a peaceful and non-violent separation. Not only do the people of northern and southern Sudan deserve it, but it is in the interest of our nation and the world to establish peace and stability in the region. Therefore, I encourage other nations to welcome the new state of Southern Sudan and assist with their transition process.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF
RYAN PIERSON ON HIS OFFER
OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND
THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT
MARINE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Ryan Pierson of Perrysburg, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, New York.

Ryan brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Perrysburg High School in Perrysburg, Ohio, Ryan consistently achieved high honors. He was also an active member of his high school band.

Throughout high school, Matthew played and received his varsity letter playing football. Ryan also recently became an Eagle Scout, following years of participation as a member of Boy Scouts of America. He also served in a number of leadership capacities throughout his years as a Boy Scout. I am confident that Ryan will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ryan Pierson on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy where he will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Ryan will excel during his career at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the nation.

HONORING COLONEL MARGUERITE
C. GARRISON

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Colonel Marguerite C. (McDonald) Garrison who will be retiring from the U.S. Army after more than thirty years of service.

Col. Garrison was born and raised in South Buffalo, NY. Upon graduating from St. Bonaventure University in 1981 with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology/Biology, she was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Military Police Corps through the ROTC.

After completing the Military Police Officer Basic Course, Col. Garrison spent nearly six years stationed in Germany, where she served as the Commander of Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment in Kornwestheim, Platoon Leader of the 194th Military Police Company in Neu Ulm, Assistant S3/Training Officer in the 385th Military Police Battalion, and finally as Commander of the 630th Military Police Company in Bamberg.

In 1987 Col. Garrison returned to the United States for the Military Police Officer Advanced

Course and was assigned to Fort McPherson, GA. From 1987 to 1991 she served as the Force Structure Officer in the Forces Command Provost Marshal Office, Assistant Secretary to the Joint, Forces Command, and the Executive Officer in the Forces Command Provost Marshal Office.

In 1992 she attended the 170th session of the FBI National Academy, one of only twelve army personnel selected annually, and after graduating from the eleven week program became the Deputy Program Director of the World University Games held in Buffalo, New York. In this position, Col. Garrison coordinated joint security planning between the military, state, and local police.

Col. Garrison went on to attend the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and was assigned as Executive Officer of the 705th Military Police Battalion. She earned a Master of Science in Administration from Central Michigan University in 1995, and in recognition of her expertise in public safety was selected as a Security Liaison for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games in Atlanta, GA.

Col. Garrison next assigned as the Inspector General of the United States Total Army Personnel Command in Alexandria, VA. From 2000 to 2002 she commanded the 5th Military Police Battalion, Criminal Investigation Command, in Kaiserslautern, Germany, and went on to serve as the Inspector General for the Army Criminal Investigation Command. Following her graduation from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Col. Garrison was assigned to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense as the Deputy Director for Antiterrorism Policy.

In her next position, Col. Garrison served as Garrison Commander at Fort McPherson and Fort Gillem, GA. Following her time in GA, she was deployed to Iraq and served in the Multi-National Force-Iraq CJ3 as the Director for Protections, Chief of Staff and Deputy Director, of Current Operations. Upon her redeployment in 2009, Col. Garrison was assigned to her current position as the Army's Chief, Initiatives Group, Vice Chief of Staff.

During her career, Col. Garrison graduated the United States Army Command and General Staff College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and, at the time of her induction, was the youngest member of the St. Bonaventure University ROTC Hall of Fame. She is married to LTC (Ret.) Kevin Garrison, and is the proud mother of her twin sons, Sean and Kieran, and her daughter, Kelsea.

Her awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit (Oak Leaf Cluster), Bronze Star Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal (with 5 Oak Leaf Clusters), Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal (with Bronze Star), Iraqi Campaign Medal (with two stars), the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon (Numeral 3), and the NATO Medal (Kosovo). Col. Garrison was also authorized to wear the Secretary of Defense and Army Staff Identification Badges and the Order of the Marechaussee in Silver.

Mr. Speaker, Col. Marguerite Garrison is a proud soldier, patriot, and Western New Yorker. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring

Col. Garrison and thanking her for her years of dedicated service in the defense of our country.

HONORING HRANT ZEITOUNZIAN

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last month, one of my constituents, Hrant Zeitounzian, passed away at the age of 101. Mr. Zeitounzian was one of the last remaining survivors of the Armenian Genocide. While Mr. Zeitounzian spent most of his life in Europe, he moved with his wife Osana to the United States in 1986 and was living in Sierra Madre, California. I wanted to take this opportunity to commemorate Mr. Zeitounzian's amazing life and to express my condolences to his family and friends. Below is a 2010 press release from the Armenian National Committee—Pasadena celebrating Mr. Zeitounzian's 100th birthday.

PASADENA, CA.—With strength and purpose, Hrant Zeitounzian, a survivor of the Armenian Genocide, celebrated his 100th birthday with family and friends on January 15, 2010. Zeitounzian marked his centennial as his family reflected on a remarkable life that began in 1910 in Gurin, a city in the Sepastia region of Western Armenia. Along with his mother, brother and sister, Hrant, at the age of five, was exiled from his homeland and sent on a death march. The Pasadena Armenian National Committee participated in the celebration of Hrant Zeitounzian's life and praised him and his family for being staunch supporters of the Armenian Cause.

For much of his life Hrant Zeitounzian has been involved in efforts to advance the Armenian Cause. As a youth in Lebanon he was very active in the Armenian Youth Federation and has long been a staunch supporter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. Over the past several years he has regularly attended the Armenian National Committee—Western Region's banquet. Several years ago he received singular praise from U.S. Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ), who cited Zeitounzian as an enduring symbol of the Armenian Cause.

Following his exile from Gurin in 1915, Zeitounzian managed to settle in Beirut, Lebanon after Turkish soldiers started hunting down innocent Armenians in and around Aintab, where his mother had found temporary shelter for her family. After graduating from elementary school, Hrant was reunited with his mother in Aleppo, Syria, where he would later become enrolled in and graduate with high honors from Aleppo College. He would go on to have a successful career at the Iraq Petroleum Company and later at the American Tapline Company in Lebanon. Following his "formal" retirement, the ever-industrious genocide survivor would successfully open a store in Beirut that specialized in selling Kodak cameras, film and supplies.

After enduring Lebanon's civil war, Hrant Zeitounzian moved to the United States in 1986 with his wife of over sixty years, Osana. Here in the United States he was reunited with his four children, his sons Vahe, Vartan and Kevoork and his daughter Haiganoush (Anoush).

A TRIBUTE IN RECOGNITION OF THE LOS ANGELES CONSERVATION CORPS' 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROVIDING SKILLS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO AT-RISK YOUNG ADULTS

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Los Angeles Conservation Corps, a non-profit organization based in the Greater Los Angeles area that is dedicated to providing at-risk young adults with opportunities through job skills training, education and work experience emphasizing conservation and service projects that benefit the community.

The organization was founded by former United States Secretary of Commerce and Trade Ambassador, Mickey Kantor in 1986. He charged a team of conservation professionals—including Bruce Saito, a founding staff member—with bringing the successful model of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) of the 1970s to an impoverished, crime-blighted South Central Los Angeles neighborhood. This team recruited 27 high-school dropouts who, before the Corps, had few career options besides gang life and drug dealing. Equipping these new "corps members" with the tools of conservation, the Corps gave them opportunities to recognize and focus their assets on building up their communities. In alignment with the CCC model, on alternating weeks, these young men and women attended school at the Corps.

Today, this tradition continues through the Young Adult Corps (YAC) program, which seeks to transform young adult high school dropouts with negative or nonexistent employment into responsible, skilled employees. Corps members work in teams led by crew supervisors who are adept at training young adults. They engage them in conservation work that is challenging, skill-building and prepares them for entry-level positions in fields such as green construction, renewable energy generation, energy efficiency, environmental remediation, forestry and firefighting.

Since its inception, the Corps' focus has been on improving job skills and education. More than 1,000 Corps members without a diploma have been assigned to the Young Adult Corps High School to complete the necessary credits for an accredited high school diploma. Supporting them throughout the process is a team of case managers and transition staff who assist them in focusing on their goals while helping to eliminate previous barriers to their success. Upon graduation, the Corps' Russell Kantor Memorial Fund continues to support these young adults by providing more than \$1.3 million in scholarships for college or advanced training.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their 25th Anniversary, I ask my congressional colleagues to please join me and the residents of the 34th Congressional District in congratulating the Los Angeles Conservation Corps for providing an invaluable service to the City of Los Angeles and our young people. I congratulate Corps Executive Director, Bruce Saito, the members of the Corps' Board of Directors and all of the many supporters who make the

Corps the treasure that it is today. I wish them and everyone involved in its growth and mission many more years of continued success.

IN HONOR OF ABRAHAM BREEHEY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Abraham Breehey, who recently passed away at the age of 35. I am honored that I have this opportunity to recognize this bright, caring and loving man.

Through his role as the Director of Legislative Affairs for the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Abe proved to be a strong force within the labor movement. He was able to transcend political differences and generate consensus for many noble causes.

Not only was Abe committed to improving the lives of all Americans, but he was also an outstanding leader in the fight against global warming and involved many unions in that effort. Abe's dedication to the labor movement and the promotion of environmental stewardship has been an inspiration. Abe's sense of civic duty even led him to testify several times before Congress, and was especially supportive of the Clear Skies Act before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

He is survived by his loving wife, Sonya and his daughter, Abigail.

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Breehey touched many lives in his community and around our nation. Abe was a champion for progressive causes who loved the Grateful Dead and Phish and it is a privilege to recognize his life. He will be missed and I know I speak for the whole House in honoring the life of this dedicated and loving man.

A TRIBUTE TO NITIN DOSHI

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Nitin Doshi.

Nitin Doshi's international roots, professional training and zest for life have all contributed towards his well deserved reputation as an entrepreneur, a philanthropist and a leader. Although born in Africa, Dr. Doshi is of Indian descent and was schooled in India as a foreign student. After graduating from Dental School in Bombay, he came to the United States in 1973 and enrolled in the NYU School of Dentistry, becoming licensed to practice in New York in 1975. He was a pioneer among Indian dentists helping many of them start and expand their practices. He was a very successful dentist and an entrepreneur who established many dental practices of his own. In 1992, due to the growing radiology practice of his wife of 40 years, Dr. Leena Doshi, he sold his dental practices and joined her in expanding the radiology practice.

Today the family is involved in a number of varied investment ventures under the umbrella of Doshi Capital Partners, including a real estate private equity fund formed in 2005, an Indian hedge fund consisting of a long/short equity fund founded in 2008, and a partnership

begun in 2008 with a private equity firm concentrating in investments in chemicals, specialty materials and healthcare.

They believe in a well balanced life and making time for everything in life. They are proud parents of Neely and her husband Todd and Nishat and his wife Fran, but the true joys of their lives are now their grandchildren, Nile, Denali and Escher, and a new granddaughter on the way. They are also part of very tight-knit group of over 30 Indian couples that all immigrated to the United States in the seventies and eighties and have supported each other and embraced the American spirit and contributed to their adopted country with enthusiasm and gratitude.

They are active and athletic and love all sorts of sports, as spectators as well as participants, with tennis and golf being their personal passion. Both have run many half marathons and Leena has also run the Long Island and New York City Marathon.

They are strong believers of social causes and support many charities. Examples of Indian organizations that the Doshi Family Foundation has partnered with include Pratham, which fulfills a mission to ensure the "Every Child in School and Learning Well" program; American Indian Foundation, committed to accelerate India's social and economic growth; and Veerayatan, which helps to rehabilitate earthquake victims, especially children, by immediately providing the basic necessities of life. The Foundation has also established two colleges in Kutch, India, one for computer science, the other for business administration, with classes having begun in June 2008.

The Doshi Family Foundation founded and funded since 1998 a New York based high school program called The Doshi Difference geared towards immigrant children's success in math and science. The program guides hand selected-children through high school and has been such a success that its curriculum has recently been offered to all students at every high school in New York.

The Doshis believe in a concentric circle of giving starting from family, to employees, to communities and believe strongly that each one of us has the ability to spread goodwill to those around us and to make a difference if we only have the desire to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the work of Nitin Doshi.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ANDREA WYANT ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young woman from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Andrea Wyant of Fostoria, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Andrea brings an enormous amount of leadership, service and dedication to the incoming Class of 2015. While attending Fostoria High

School in Fostoria, Ohio, Andrea attained a grade point average that placed her in the top ten percent of her graduating class. Andrea was inducted into the National Honor Society, was a member of the Quiz Bowl team, served as president of the Fostoria High School band and served on student council for three years. Throughout high school, Andrea was also a member of the varsity swim team, which she was captain of her senior year, and the varsity tennis team. I am confident that Andrea will carry the lessons of her student leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrea Wyant on the acceptance of her appointment to the United States Air Force Academy where she will gain a world-class education and invaluable leadership experience. I am positive that Andrea will excel during her career at the United States Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to the nation.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALABAMA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ON HOME ECONOMICS

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of my home state's success stories. I wish to congratulate Alabama's Cooperative Extension Service on Home Economics as it celebrates 100 years of serving the people with valuable economic and nutrition education.

The Alabama Extension Service has its origins in Walker and Pike counties in 1911 when two part-time home agents with a budget of \$300 enrolled 240 girls in popular Girl's Tomato Clubs where they were taught to grow tomatoes and can them.

In 1914, the program was made a part of the land grant college system, giving instructions and demonstrations to persons not enrolled in colleges or universities.

Through the years, many of the Alabama Extension Home Economics programs have been innovative and successful, capturing the attention of other states which have replicated them. These include Master Money Manager, expanded food and nutrition education, Parents Encouraging Parents and Project HELP.

During World Wars I and II, the Alabama Extension Home Economics programs provided valuable instruction in substituting rationed food items, supervised canning centers, salvaging scrap metal and rubber, and selling war bonds.

Today, such home economics programs range from family life, nutrition and health, clothing, housing and family resource management, and are constantly updated to meet new challenges, serve expanding and new audiences, and responding to local problems and opportunities.

The Alabama Extension Home Economics programs have paralleled the history of our country and state for the last 100 years. Through boom times and bust, the program has met the needs of Alabama homemakers and families.

I join with my fellow Alabamians in thanking the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service on Home Economics for its many valuable contributions to our state and I congratulate the program on its 100th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. OLYN KELLY MATTHEWS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the life of Dr. Olyn Kelly Matthews.

Dr. Matthews was an integral part of the Northwest Florida community. For 45 years, Dr. Matthews practiced veterinary medicine in Escambia, Santa Rosa and Okaloosa counties. He began practicing in Northwest Florida in 1944, when he took a job as an assistant state veterinarian. Dr. Matthews was born on a farm, and he dedicated his veterinary practice to helping farmers keep their livestock healthy and productive. Dr. Matthews was the veterinarian for 26 dairies and multiple farms throughout the area.

Dr. Matthews was a true family man. In 1947 he married Elizabeth Campbell. Dr. and Mrs. Campbell immersed themselves in the lives of their children and their local community through church activities and sports.

The impact Dr. Matthews had on the Northwest Florida community extended far beyond his veterinary practice. A pivotal leader in the local community, Dr. Matthews was elected to the Santa Rosa County School Board in 1966. He also served as president of the Milton Kiwanis Club, Milton Quarterback Club and the Northwest Florida Veterinary Medical Association, and he was campaign chairman of the United Way of Santa Rosa County for two years. In 1990, he was selected as "Man of the Year" by the Santa Rosa County Chamber of Commerce.

To some Dr. Olyn Matthews will be remembered as a community leader and to others as a dedicated doctor of veterinary medicine. To his family, he will forever be remembered as a loving husband, father and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the life of Dr. Olyn Matthews of Milton, Florida. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers for his entire family. He will be truly missed by all of us.

IN RECOGNITION OF EARTHFEST 2011

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Earth Day Coalition of Cleveland, as they celebrate EarthFest 2011 on April 17, 2011—a date that also commemorates the 22nd annual celebration of EarthFest in Cleveland, Ohio.

Cleveland's Earth Day Coalition was formed in 1990 to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day in Ohio. EarthFest is now Ohio's

largest environmental educational event and the longest running Earth Day celebration in the nation. I stand in recognition of the staff and volunteers of the Earth Day Coalition for all their effort and dedication in creating such an innovative, exciting and educational event for the Greater Cleveland community to enjoy. This year, EarthFest's theme is "Climate Change Solutions." Over 175 environmental exhibits are expected from environmental and community organizations, government entities and businesses. EarthFest is just one of Earth Day Coalition's many nationally-recognized programs and promises once again to be a significant aspect of the world celebration of Earth Day.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of the staff, volunteers, and members of the Earth Day Coalition as we celebrate EarthFest 2011 on April 17, 2011. EarthFest 2011 promises to educate, inspire and motivate all of us to join together as a community and work toward a more healthy Earth for future generations.

HONORING DR. JOSÉ RIZAL

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Dr. José Rizal in celebration of the 150th anniversary of his birth on June 19, 1861. His writings and dedication to his country continue to inspire Filipinos, who widely regard him as the national hero of the Philippines. His allegiance to his homeland resonates with Filipino-Americans, and stirs a renewed patriotism in the hearts of all Americans.

A doctor, philosopher, historian, and artist, Dr. Rizal is best known for his influential writings during the Philippine struggle for independence. Born in the Philippine province of Laguna in 1861, he traveled throughout the world for his studies and medical practice, earning degrees from universities in the Philippines and Europe. While studying in Spain in 1887, he wrote two novels, *Noli Me Tangere* and its sequel *El Filibusterismo*, depicting the Filipinos' devotion to their country and yearning for freedom from colonial rule. These works inspired the struggle for independence in the Philippines but also placed Rizal's life in danger of persecution by the ruling government.

Eager to be of service to his country's cause, Dr. Rizal returned to the Philippines in 1892. Upon his return, he was exiled to the South of the Philippines. Despite great struggles, he sought to improve the lives of those around him by building a medical clinic, conducting religious classes, and teaching agricultural practices. Four years later, as the Philippine Revolution began to strengthen, he was convicted of inciting the rebellion with his writings and was sentenced to death. On the eve of his execution, Dr. Rizal wrote *Mi Ultimo adiós*, a poem bidding farewell to his beloved country, attesting to his dedication to seeking a free and independent country.

Dr. Rizal's legacy lives on in his writings, and Filipinos throughout the world remember him as the idealistic force behind their struggle for independence. He fought for his country

not with the sword, but with the peaceful power of his ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. José Rizal. We remember his legacy in honor of the Filipino-Americans in our communities. May his legacy continue to instill in all of us a renewed dedication to serving our country.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS STATE REPRESENTATIVE
SENFRONIA THOMPSON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend of mine, a maverick, a community visionary, a leader, and a true Texan and recognize the achievements and outstanding service of a very special person, Senfronia Thompson.

Senfronia will be "roasted" by the Texas Southern University and Governor Rick Perry, Speaker Joe Straus, Senators Rodney Ellis and John Whitmire, Representative Sylvester Turner, former Representative Debra Danburg, former Representative Mark Stiles and others to raise funds for a wonderful cause, the Texas Legislative Internship Program (TLIP) administered by The Mickey Leland Center at the University. The event will be held at the Mickey Leland Center at Texas Southern University on April 11, 2011, at the University of Texas Alumni Center.

The TLIP is a premier internship program that introduces the best and brightest of our Texas youth to the innerworkings of government and the true value of public service. The program, developed in 1990, is sponsored by Senator Rodney Ellis. Since its inception, more than 400 students accepted into the TLIP program have interned with members of the Texas Legislature, the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This year, 63 interns are working in and around the Texas State Capitol during the current legislative session.

In 1973, Senfronia Thompson was elected to the Texas State House of Representatives from Houston. She has continued to serve her constituents in honor ever since. She now ranks as the longest-serving woman and the longest-serving African-American in Texas State legislature history.

Representative Thompson authored and passed Texas' first alimony law, the James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Act, laws prohibiting racial profiling, the state minimum wage, the Durable Powers of Attorney Act, the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, the Sexual Assault Program Fund, the Model School Records Flagging Act, the Uniform Child Custody and Jurisdiction Enforcement Act, contraceptive parity, prohibiting small print in cell phone ads, and scores of other reforms benefiting women, children and the elderly.

The former chair of one of the Legislature's most active committees, Judicial Affairs, Representative Thompson pushed through major reforms in child support enforcement, simplified probate proceedings, and complete overhauls of statutes dealing with statutory courts and municipal courts. Representative

Thompson continues to be among the most successful House members in passing bills into laws.

Representative Thompson has been in the forefront of every major campaign against discrimination in the last three decades. Ms. Thompson has among the highest ranks of any legislator for her voting record on issues of concern to women, minorities, labor, consumers, reform advocates, domestic violence victims, the elderly, teachers and civil libertarians. Among many other honors, she was named "Woman of the Year" by bipartisan Texas Women's Political Caucus in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Senfronia Thompson my friend and my colleague in public service. I had the pleasure of serving beside Senfronia Thompson, a champion of civic participation, when we were both freshman legislators together in 1973. It was an honor to serve with her then and it is an honor for me to be able to recognize her today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and thanking Representative Thompson for her extraordinary service to Texas and our country.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF PACIFIC
McGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW TEAM

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again acknowledge and honor a University of Pacific McGeorge School of Law team that participated at the American Bar Association National Appellate Advocacy 34th annual competition held April 7-9, 2011, at the U.S. District Courthouse for the Northern District of Illinois in Chicago.

The team of Caitlin Urie Christian, '11, Jill Larrabee, '12, and Leo Moniz, '12, advanced to the round of 16 and took ninth place. They also won the Best Brief Award; an outstanding accomplishment in its own right, considering over two hundred teams participated in the competition.

The competition involved two issues this year: whether a pre-enforcement challenge under the First Amendment is ripe for judicial review and whether a state statute, passed as a means to tackle a crystal methamphetamine epidemic, is constitutional under the Supreme Court's commercial speech jurisprudence.

They were coached by Professors Ed Telfeyan, '75, and Erich Shiners, '06, and assisted by Andrea Dupray, '11, a member of the 2009-2010 Moot Court Honors Board.

Previously the winners of a similar award in the San Francisco regional, this time the writing of Christian, Larrabee and Moniz faced an entire new battery of graders who read all 24 briefs for the finals in Chicago. To put the award in perspective, their work was judged the best out of 217 teams competing nationally.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the students and coaches from McGeorge School of Law on their outstanding performance at the 2011 regional competition in San Francisco and at the national finals in Chicago. I'm pleased to honor their hard work and dedication to the study of the law.

IN HONOR OF THE ASSOCIATION OF INDIAN PHYSICIANS OF NORTHERN OHIO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Association of Indian Physicians of Northern Ohio.

The Association of Indian Physicians of Northern Ohio (AIPNO) is a non-profit organization that was founded in 1983, with the mission of using its united resources and knowledge for the welfare and healthier living of the community that they serve. The organization hosts bi-annual Health-Fairs where member physicians volunteer their time and skills to those of the community free of charge. Their continued service to both the nation and the state of Ohio exemplify responsibility and civic virtue.

In addition to their health fairs, the Association of Indian Physicians of Northern Ohio is a supporter of medical camps in India, such as the Medical and Surgical Camp of Bidada Sarvodaya Trust in Kachchh. These camps provide medical and surgical treatment to over 1200 villages and impoverished areas.

The Association of Indian Physicians of Northern Ohio runs various continuing education and learning programs for its members and students. The organization also has its own medical journal, AIPNO Pulse, and provides medical advice to residents of Northern Ohio through their contributions to Lotus, a community publication.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor of the Association of Indian Physicians of Northern Ohio, which works to unite Indian physicians in order to achieve their mission of providing their combined skills and knowledge for the betterment of Ohio and service to the community.

TRIBUTE TO TELACU FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO THE ADVANCEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT OF LATINOS

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today and ask Congress to recognize May 20th as TELACU Scholars Day.

The TELACU Education Foundation was established in 1983 to respond to crisis-level dropout rates for Latino Students and has since grown into the largest community and economic development corporation in the United States. TELACU is a pioneering institution committed to service, empowerment, advancement and the creation of self-sufficiency within the Latino community.

To address the distinct struggles many Latino youth face, TELACU established the LINC TELACU Education Foundation (LTEF). For upwards of two decades, the Education Foundation has been working towards removing the formidable barriers that could prevent Latino youth from achieving academic success

and providing them with professional and academic role models. I am proud of the way the LINC TELACU Education Foundation has contributed to the development of our future Latino leaders.

The TELACU Education Foundation realized that there is no more vital asset in any community than its human capital and began their efforts to reverse these trends. For instance, The LINC TELACU Scholarship Program is an exemplary program that helps students realize their dream of a college education by providing scholarships and supplemental support.

Although TELACU understands that financial assistance is a vital component for college students to achieve academic success, they also recognize the underlying challenges many young adults face including socio-economic factors, family responsibilities, cultural identity, and financial solvency. Students who are the first member of their families to pursue a college degree often must make their own academic support system in order to achieve their dreams. TELACU understands these challenges.

The LINC TELACU Scholarship Program provides its youth not only with monetary assistance, but with the counseling, leadership training, and time management training necessary to help students achieve their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor TELACU, the LINC TELACU Education Foundation and for Scholarship programs like this one, for believing in the dream of higher education for all of America's next generation of leaders. I extend my congratulations to the TELACU scholars and the people who make their dreams a reality as they celebrate the 28th Annual TELACU Education Foundation Scholarship Awards Dinner, Building the Dream, on Friday May 20th, 2011.

ARMENIA REMEMBRANCE DAY

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 2011, the world will commemorate Armenian Remembrance Day and remember the one-and-a-half million Armenians that endured unspeakable suffering and loss at the hand of the Ottoman Empire during World War I.

In addition to the loss of so many Armenian lives, the twentieth century also bore witness to the loss of six-million Jews and four-hundred thousand other persons deemed "non-desirable" by the Nazis, the loss of millions of lives in Russia and in China by communist tyrannies, and modern day horrors in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Darfur. All too often, we have not learned from past genocides. As the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment" and that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Though nothing changes the fact that mass killings and unspeakable acts of brutality occurred, today I wish to learn from the past to better bring about hope for a brighter, more peaceful future and reconciliation of the people of Armenia and Turkey.

Only with a thorough examination of history and open acknowledgement of the past will

the plight of the Armenians be fully understood.

As we continue confronting atrocities taking place today, and seek to prevent them from occurring in the future, we must also be resolute in acknowledging genocides of the past.

A TRIBUTE TO SARAH SAVAGE RAYMOND

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sarah Savage Raymond.

Sarah Savage Raymond has been a resident of Brooklyn since 1927, when, at the age of 22, she moved from her home in Baltimore. During her more than 80 years in Brooklyn and the Tenth Congressional district, Mrs. Raymond has been a positive example for all and a valued member of her community.

Mrs. Sarah Savage Raymond has been involved with the First AME Zion Church, originally the Fleet Street Church, since she first moved to New York and remains an active participant. The First AME Zion Church is where Sarah met and married her husband, Mr. Robert Raymond and where she became involved in her adopted community, becoming a member in the lodge and on the committee visiting the sick.

Through more than a century of life, Mrs. Raymond has kept her indomitable spirit and remains alert and energetic. Although Mrs. Raymond has no biological children, she has three very close relatives that are extremely supportive of her who live in the Bronx, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. She also has five nieces and nephews that reside in Maryland that also keep in touch with her. Mrs. Sarah Savage Raymond has seen and heard what most of us could only read in history books and she is always willing to share her experiences with those who are interested in listening.

Mrs. Raymond says that she is "thankful" to be one hundred six years of age because she did not expect to live this long. She adds, "I appreciate every year and did the best that I could." It is precisely this humble and exemplary attitude that has preserved Mrs. Raymond in health and happiness for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mrs. Raymond for her extraordinary accomplishments and her spirit which reflect the best our nation has to offer.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST FLIGHT OF THE SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Chairman RALPH HALL joins me as I rise today to recognize this week's 30th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Shuttle. On April 12, 1981, Space Shuttle *Columbia* was successfully launched from the Kennedy Space Center's Launch Pad 39A at

7 a.m. Under the capable control of Commander John W. Young and pilot Robert L. Crippen, the STS-1 mission showed that a safe launch into orbit and safe return of the orbiter and crew was possible. In performing the test flight, Space Shuttle *Columbia* traveled over 1 million miles at an orbital altitude of 166 nautical miles. This was the first of over 130 shuttle missions over a period of 30 years during which astronauts recovered and repaired satellites including the Hubble Space Telescope, conducted cutting-edge research, and built and supported the largest structure in space, the International Space Station.

Mr. Speaker, on this 30th anniversary of the first flight of the Space Shuttle, we are also on the verge of retiring the Space Shuttle fleet. It is appropriate to honor the brave individuals who have paid the ultimate price so that the Nation could pursue its goals, vision, and leadership in human spaceflight and exploration and to recognize the bravery and heroism of all astronauts who have flown on the Space Shuttle. It is also appropriate to acknowledge the tireless and dedicated work of the men and women of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (“NASA”), its field centers, and its contractors without whom these achievements would not have been possible.

The Space Shuttle has been a source of pride and inspiration for the American people. It sparked interest in many fields of engineering and science which benefitted the United States economy, inspired successive generations, and contributed to our leadership in science and technology. We must continue to provide our children and grandchildren with a similar source of inspiration. As the chapter on the Space Shuttle closes later this year, a new chapter in the book of human exploration begins.

Today, unlike 30 years ago, our leadership in space is being contested by many other nations. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reaffirming our support for NASA and in committing to a robust national program of human space flight and exploration. That will be the best way to mark this historic anniversary.

HONORING SHRINERS HOSPITAL
FOR CHILDREN—CHICAGO

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 85th anniversary of its founding, I rise today to honor and recognize the outstanding impact that the Shriners Hospital for Children has had on the lives of children in Chicago. It is their mission to provide the highest quality health care to all children with orthopedic and neuromusculoskeletal conditions.

The Shriners founded their first children’s hospital in Shreveport, Louisiana in 1922, and since then, their network has grown to include 21 more hospitals. The Chicago facility was founded on March 20, 1926 in the historic Oak Park District. Here, children are treated for a host of orthopedic and neuromusculoskeletal conditions, spinal cord injuries, as well as cleft lip and palate. Not only do they provide for the needs of the children, the hospital takes into

account the needs of the whole family throughout all phases of the child’s injury and recuperation, including free transportation to and from the hospital if necessary. Once children are accepted for treatment, they become part of the Shriners Hospital System and are provided treatment for all facets of their condition.

All care is provided by an interdisciplinary team which works together to integrate the expertise of all appropriate healthcare disciplines in one center. In addition to providing treatment for these conditions, all Shriners Hospitals for Children are dedicated to continuing research in their specific fields and discovering new knowledge to better improve the quality of the lives of their patients and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Shriners Hospital for Children in Chicago for its dedication to providing healthcare to suffering children without regard to religion, race, nationality, disability, or ability of the family to pay. This organization provides an invaluable service to the city and has improved the lives of countless Chicago children. I thank them once again for their 85 years of exceptional services to children in need and their families.

PROCLAMATION FOR DR. JOHN
LOGAN CASHIN, JR.

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a great American, Dr. John Logan Cashin, Jr., a visionary civil rights leader and extraordinary Alabamian.

Dr. Cashin was born in Huntsville, AL on April 16, 1928 to John Logan Sr., a dentist, and the former Grace Brandon, a school principal. His parents were active in social justice and civil rights work. His paternal grandfather, Herschel V. Cashin, served in the Alabama Legislature during Reconstruction. Dr. Cashin received his B.A. degree from Fisk University and D.D.S. degree from Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee and joined his father in dental practice. He was a devoted member of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr. was drafted into the U.S. Army, where he was made a first lieutenant and Chief of dental services for soldiers stationed near Fontainebleau, France. Dr. Cashin Jr.’s wife of 39 years, Joan Carpenter Cashin, died in 1997. They are survived by their children, Sheryll Cashin Esq., Professor of Law at Georgetown University, John M. Cashin of Lagos, Nigeria and Carroll L. Cashin of Huntsville, Alabama. Dr. Cashin has five grand-children: Winton, Etalvia, Jasmine, Langston and Logan. He is also survived by his wife, the former Dr. Louise R. White of Washington, D.C. whom he married in 1998.

As a visionary leader in the struggle for social justice and equal rights for African Americans, Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr. founded the National Democratic Party of Alabama in 1968 and served as its Chairman until it disbanded in 1976.

Under the leadership of Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr., the National Democratic Party of Alabama changed the face of local political leaders in office throughout the state. In November of 1968, seventeen of the party’s candidates won

local offices in Alabama’s Black Belt region, comprising seventeen counties in the central and western part of the state.

In 1970, Dr. John L. Cashin Jr., ran for Governor of the State of Alabama as the first African American candidate since Reconstruction. His courage paved the way for numerous African American candidates to win and hold elected offices. Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr. passed away on March 21, 2011 at the age of 82 in Washington, D.C.

Therefore I, Terri A. Sewell, Representative to the United States Congress from the 7th District of Alabama, do hereby recognize Dr. John Logan Cashin, Jr. for his numerous contributions to the region, state, and nation. I do hereby extend deepest sympathy to the family of Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr., a visionary leader for the Civil Rights movement who never forgot his roots, and who fought for equalities for all mankind. I stand on the shoulders of Dr. John L. Cashin, Jr. and for that I am eternally grateful.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 658, THE FAA
REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM
ACT OF 2011

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Messrs. Garret, Engel, Andrews, and Himes.

Since the publication of the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) “preferred alternative” for the New York/New Jersey/Philadelphia Metropolitan Airspace Redesign project, I have sponsored and cosponsored several similar amendments that have sought to rectify this deeply flawed project that will increase aircraft noise over Northern New Jersey.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and the New Jersey legislature, I have been a staunch advocate for reducing aircraft noise. I have attended dozens of public hearings, had meetings with officials from the FAA, and responded to thousands of calls from constituents whose lives have been affected by existing air traffic patterns and related noise.

While the safety of passengers is paramount, and the vitality of the air transport system is important, people on the ground have a right to a quality of life with a minimum exposure to aircraft noise overhead.

I understand the need for improving the efficiency of our Nation’s aviation infrastructure to better accommodate the high demand for flights.

However, the FAA has continually turned a “deaf ear” to the issue of aircraft noise, which affects all citizens on the ground, regardless of whether they travel by plane or not.

Again, I have long fought against such noise increases. In particular, I strongly opposed the FAA’s original redesign proposal in 2005, which would have had substantial noise increases throughout the New Jersey and New York metropolitan areas.

The FAA’s amended plan included some noise reductions from their original proposal, but did not go far enough.

Now, despite strong opposition from Members of Congress and citizens throughout the

region, the FAA is plowing ahead with its redesign plan, despite its flaws with respect to increased aircraft noise exposure. The FAA must cease this flawed redesign plan and come back to the drawing board to develop a proposal that strikes the proper balance between airspace efficiency and preventing noise increases, as well as any other environmental impacts.

I urge the FAA to carefully consider alternatives that accomplish this goal. We must not forget about the "silent majority" of constituents on the ground!

I urge support for this amendment and any effort to reduce the impact of aircraft noise above New Jersey.

RECOGNIZING THE DC 41

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the 41 District of Columbia elected officials and residents who stood up for the self-governing rights of the American citizens who reside in the nation's capital by sitting down in a peaceful act of civil disobedience on Constitution Avenue in front of the Dirksen Senate Office Building on Monday, April 15, 2011. The rally, organized by DC Vote, protested the final 2011 continuing resolution (CR) which contains two anti-home-rule riders. The CR prohibits the District from spending its local taxpayer-raised funds on abortions for low-income women, even though many state and local jurisdictions have done so for decades. Without consultation with any District of Columbia elected official, the CR also mandates a D.C.-only private school voucher program, while the House Republican majority refuses to bring a bill to the floor that would allow districts that desire this alternative to select it on a home-rule basis. The District of Columbia is almost alone in the nation in establishing a robust alternative to our local public schools, our public charter schools, which educate almost 40 percent of the city's children and have long waiting lists. The House voted to approve these riders while denying voting representation in this body to District of Columbia residents.

The D.C. elected officials who engaged in civil disobedience were D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray, Council Chair Kwame Brown, At-Large Council members Sekou Biddle and Michael Brown, Council members Yvette Alexander, Muriel Bowser, and Thomas Wells, and House Shadow Representative Michael Panetta. The District residents were Ann Aldrich, Lafayette Barnes, Peter Bishop, Robert Brannum, Jason Cross, Billie Day, Jack Evans, Marc Ferrara, Corryn Freeman, Mary Gosselink, Lawrence Hams, Karen Hixson, Anise Jenkins, Eugene Kinlow, John Klenert, Rachel Madelham, Adam Maier, George Marion, Jr., Nicholas McCoy, Martin Moulton, Brian Pate, Joseph Perta, Jeffrey Richardson, Deangelo Scott, Deborah Shore, Carly Skidmore, Daniel Solomon, Bruce Spiva, Jay Tamboli, Maceo Thomas, Ryan Velasco, Patricia Vrandenburg, and Ilir Zherka.

The city has long advocated its rights through the usual channels and official re-

sponses. However, from the day the 112th Congress convened, the House Republican majority has repeatedly introduced bills to violate the rights of our citizens, beginning with the approval of new rules that summarily stripped the District of the only vote on the House floor it has achieved, the House Committee of the Whole vote, approved by the federal courts.

The DC 41, as they are called, recognized that the House Republican majority intends to return with more anti-home-rule riders. An additional anti-home-rule rider was included in the original Republican spending bill, H.R. 1, but failed this time to become a part of the final agreement. The message of the DC 41 was that DC elected officials and residents will not walk away from the infringement of their rights to govern themselves and to spend their taxpayer-raised local funds as they choose.

I ask the House to join me in saluting the DC 41, who acted in the long American tradition of incurring arrests during peaceful civil disobedience to protect and to further their right to full equality with the residents of the 50 states.

RECOGNIZING RONALD
MCNAMARA'S 25 YEARS OF SERVICE ON THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to pay tribute to Ron McNamara, and to thank him for 25 years of faithful and dedicated service to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Commission. Ron joined the staff of the Helsinki Commission on April 14, 1986, at a time when many OSCE countries suffered under Soviet repression and widespread violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Ron's relationship with the Helsinki Commission actually precedes 1986, having served as the liaison to the Commission for the former Senator from New York, Alfonse D'Amato. Perhaps as a result of this experience, Ron got up to speed quickly. He was soon negotiating human rights and humanitarian issues at the Vienna Follow-Up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is today the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE. From late 1986 to 1989 he was stationed in Vienna and participated in this multilateral negotiation—progress in the respect of human rights in the Soviet Union and its East European allies had suddenly become possible. As part of the team that translated that potentiality into reality, Ron stayed on top of ever-changing developments, networked with our European allies on strategy, and pressed the one-party communist governments to adopt a new set of human rights commitments. When the Berlin Wall fell and multi-party elections were scheduled, Ron's diplomatic skills helped produce landmark documents which solidified democracy as the chosen form of government and clarified the understanding that a government's treatment of its citizens is not an inter-

nal matter but rather a legitimate concern to all. Ron was especially instrumental in negotiating new commitments in the area of cross-border human contacts, which led to greater freedom of movement for those previously denied permission to emigrate to reunite with their families or travel to visit family members.

Throughout the years, he has been deeply involved with preparations for the annual sessions of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. He has served as a member of numerous U.S. delegations to various OSCE conferences and as an OSCE election observer in Georgia, Belarus, Ukraine, Russia and Azerbaijan. Ron also participated in Commission efforts to respond to the genocidal and other atrocities in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He was particularly active in legislative efforts to lift the arms embargo on that country, which had denied it the capacity to exercise its rights of self-defense in the face of Bosnian Serb aggression. Ron's portfolio has also included work with Turkey, Greece and Cyprus, religious liberty issues and combating anti-Semitism. A notable result of Ron's work was the willingness of the Turkish government to allow a more open dialogue on human rights and civil society in return for agreement on holding the 1999 OSCE Summit in Istanbul. In addition to his ongoing human rights work, Ron at times has had the Commission staff portfolio for security issues and for economic cooperation.

During 2001–2002, Ron served with distinction as Chief of Staff under the Chairmanship of Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, and in both 1999–2000 and 2003–2004 served as Deputy Chief of Staff under my Chairmanship. I have often benefited from Ron's counsel and have always been impressed by his deep integrity. Since Senator Campbell's retirement, he has served in a variety of capacities, including International Policy Advisor. His knowledge and insight into the workings of the U.S. government and various OSCE institutions has proved invaluable to the work of the Commission. He is a man of great prudence and justice.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am very pleased to commend and thank Ron McNamara for his faithful, dedicated and tireless service to the Helsinki Commission and to the cause of human dignity and freedom.

CELEBRATING THIRTY YEARS OF
BEAUTILLION COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Donna LaVerne Daniels Rice, a community activist, businesswoman, councilmember, and founder of the Columbia, Maryland chapter of Jack and Jill of America's Beautillion Ball. For the past 30 years, outstanding high school juniors and seniors from Columbia, Maryland; Baltimore, Maryland; and Washington, D.C. have been selected, honored and praised for their accomplishments as they move from one stage of their lives to the next.

Through stimulating educational workshops, mentoring, culturally enriching experiences,

and positive self-concept development, the Beautillion philosophy helps to prepare young men so that they can prosper as contributing members of society. In order to be selected as a "beau," these young men must have at least a "C" average and excel in one of four areas: academics, the arts, community service, and sports. Of course, most of the young men honored excel in more than one area.

The tireless dedication and devotion of my friend, Donna Rice, ensures that wonderful events that transform young people's lives happen each and every year. For that, I thank her. As a fellow Fisk University graduate, and member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., Ms. Rice has a long list of other achievements, honors, and awards. None are more valuable, however, than the experience and honor we both share of mentoring young black boys and teenagers. We share the same concern for the plight of young African American boys, and from this concern, Ms. Rice began her community leadership and scholarship project. Her once meager project has now been duplicated in 53 other cities throughout the United States and the Bahamas.

Tonight, as ten young men are honored as the leaders of tomorrow, let us also honor a leader of today—Ms. Donna LaVerne Daniels Rice, devoted wife to Dr. William Rice and the mother of three adult children. I thank my friend for her devotion to saving our young black boys.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know I had been granted medical leave to recover from hip replacement surgery for the legislative weeks of March 28 and April 4. While I was unable to place recorded votes on legislation considered by the House, I would like to state what my votes would have been.

On Tuesday, March 29, the House considered H.R. 839, the HAMP Termination Act of 2011, introduced by Representative MCHENRY of North Carolina. On rollcall vote No. 194, H. Amdt. 199 offered by Representative HANNA of New York, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 195, H. Amdt. 204 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 196, H. Amdt. 206 offered by Representative MALONEY of New York, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 197, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative LARSEN of Washington, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 198, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Wednesday, March 30, the House considered H. Res. 186, introduced by Representative BISHOP of Utah, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 471) to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote No. 199, on ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 200, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 201, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on March 30, the House considered H.R. 471, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, introduced by Speaker BOEHNER. On rollcall vote No. 202, H. Amdt. 209 offered by Delegate NORTON of the District of Columbia, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 203, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative CUMMINGS of Maryland, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 204, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Thursday, March 31, the House considered H. Res. 189, introduced by Representative WEBSTER of Florida, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote 205, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

Also on March 31, the House considered H.R. 872, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, introduced by Representative GIBBS (OH), under a suspension of the Rules. On rollcall vote 206, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, I would have voted "yes."

Further on March 31, the House began consideration of H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011, introduced by Representative MICA of Florida. On rollcall vote 207, H. Amdt. 210 offered by Representative MICA of Florida, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 208, H. Amdt. 216 offered by Representative GARRETT of New Jersey, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 209, H. Amdt. 217 offered by Representative DEFAZIO of Oregon, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 210, H. Amdt. 218 offered by Representative HIRONO of Hawaii, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 211, H. Amdt. 225 offered by Representative CAPUANO of Massachusetts, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 212, H. Amdt. 226 offered by Representative GINGREY of Georgia, I would have voted "yes."

On Friday, April 1, the House considered H. Res. 194, offered by Representative WOODALL of Georgia, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1255) to prevent a shutdown of the government of the United States, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote 213, On Consideration of the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

Also, the House continued consideration of H.R. 658. On rollcall vote No. 214, H. Amdt. 235 offered by Representative PEARCE of New Mexico, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 215, H. Amdt. 236 offered by Representative SCHIFF of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 216, H. Amdt. 228 offered by Representative SESSIONS of Texas, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 217, H. Amdt. 229 offered by Representative LATOURETTE of Ohio, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 218, H. Amdt. 232 offered by Representative SHUSTER of Pennsylvania, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 219, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative SANCHEZ of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 220, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

The House then resumed consideration of H. Res. 194. On rollcall vote No. 221, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 222, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

The House then considered H.R. 1255, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011, introduced by Representative STEVE WOMACK of Arkansas. On rollcall vote No. 223, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, offered by Representative WALZ of Minnesota, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 224, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Monday, April 4, the House considered H.R. 1246, to reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction, introduced by Representative ALLEN WEST, under a Suspension of the Rules. On rollcall vote 225, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, I would have voted "yes."

On Tuesday, April 5, the House considered H. Res. 200, introduced by Representative WOODALL (GA), providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices. On rollcall vote No. 226, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 227, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 228, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

On Wednesday, April 6, the House voted on a Motion to Adjourn by Representative JACKSON of Illinois. On this rollcall vote No. 229, I would have voted "no."

The House then considered H. Res. 203, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes, introduced by Representative SESSIONS of Texas. On rollcall vote No. 230, On Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 231, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 232, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on Wednesday, the House began consideration of H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011, introduced by Representative UPTON of Michigan. On rollcall vote No. 233, H. Amdt. 240 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 234, H. Amdt. 241 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 235, H. Amdt. 244 offered by Representative MURPHY of Connecticut, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 236, H. Amdt. 245 offered by Representative WAXMAN of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 237, H. Amdt. 247 offered by Representative POLIS of Colorado, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 238, H. Amdt. 248 offered by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 239, H. Amdt. 249 offered by Representative RUSH of Illinois, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 240, H. Amdt. 250 offered by Representative DOYLE of Pennsylvania, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 241, H. Amdt. 251 offered by Representative KIND of Wisconsin, I would have voted "no."

On Thursday, April 7, the House considered H. Res. 206, offered by Representative FOXX of Virginia, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1363) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. On rollcall vote No. 242, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 243, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 244, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on April 7, the House considered H.R. 1363, the Department of Defense and Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, introduced by Representative ROGERS of Kentucky. On rollcall vote No. 245, Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 246, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative OWENS of New York, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 247, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

Then the House completed consideration of H.R. 910. On rollcall vote No. 248, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative MCNERNY of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 249, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Friday, April 8, the House considered H.J. Res. 37, Disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices, introduced by Representative WALDEN of Oregon. On rollcall vote No. 250, On Consideration of the Joint Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 251, Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 252, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Saturday, April 9, the House considered H.R. 1363, Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, introduced by Representative ROGERS of Kentucky. On rollcall vote No. 253, on Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment, I would have voted "yes."

REMEMBERING THE TRAGIC GULF OIL SPILL AND WORKING TO PREVENT FUTURE SPILLS

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a tragic event. One year ago, next Wednesday, an oil rig explosion in the Gulf of Mexico resulted in eleven families losing their loved ones. The explosion started what soon became the largest oil spill in United States history. It took far too long to stop this spill and the environmental and economic impacts will be felt for years to come. Twelve months later, Congress has not enacted any legislation to address the policy and management issues that contributed to the severity of last year's spill. This is unacceptable. We owe it to those who perished in the explosion, as well as those whose lives and businesses were impacted in the months that followed, to address the deficiencies in current federal policy.

That is why I am reintroducing the SAFEGUARDS Act, legislation I drafted last year to prevent and respond to future oil spills. I was not surprised that a report by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling (Oil Spill Commission) highlighted the need for the changes I recommend, as the measure was developed following a series of meetings and regular phone calls with the on-the-ground incident commanders, local research teams and community emergency response personnel. It is my hope that the solutions put forth in this measure will be included in a wider legislative response to ensure that we impose rigorous safety standards on any off-shore platforms, while also establishing a fully thought out plan to respond to future disasters.

As I said last Congress, an uncontrolled discharge of oil is truly a worst-case scenario that oil companies and the federal government should be required to have an established plan for. While the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) has established specific safeguards to take into account the effects that drilling has on our environment, BP was permitted categorical exclusions from these requirements. No oil company should be exempt from addressing the environmental impact that their drilling activities impose. The SAFEGUARDS Act will ensure that NEPA requirements are not ignored again by, first, prohibiting categorical exclusions from NEPA, and second, extending the time period regulatory agencies have to review oil explorations proposals. Regulatory agencies currently have only a 30-day period to review extensive and intricate drilling proposals, however this bill will give regulatory agencies up to 150 days to ensure exploration plans are properly reviewed.

Not only was BP granted exemptions from environmental standards, they were also allowed to move forward without a prepared response plan for the failure of the blowout preventer. As recommended by the Oil Spill Commission "oil spill response plans should be required to include detailed plans for source control [which] demonstrate that an operator's containment technology is immediately deployable and effective." The SAFEGUARDS Act would require all oil spill response plans to

account for a true worst possible scenario, including the uncontrolled discharge of oil resulting from the failure of a blowout preventer or other containment devices.

The oil disaster in the Gulf has also brought much attention to the leadership and organization of the response and containment efforts currently in place. While the Coast Guard is ultimately responsible for leading the government's response to an oil spill in America's coastal waters, they are not required to approve oil spill response plans submitted by oil rigs. Instead, each rig was only required to submit their spill response plans to the now disbanded Minerals Management Service, an agency with many well-documented problems administering rig safety standards. The Oil Spill Commission notes that "oil spill response plans, including source-control measures, should be subject to interagency review and approval by the Coast Guard." The SAFEGUARDS Act will make this a requirement for all current and future oil rigs, as well as establish the Commandant of the Coast Guard as the National Incident Commander to oversee the federal government's response to large oil spills in coastal waters.

Finally, the SAFEGUARDS Act will address some of the inadequacies in federal response efforts highlighted by last year's spill. The framework of the National Contingency Plan, which is the federal government response plan for all oil spills, has not been updated since 1994. The SAFEGUARDS Act will require the response plan to be updated at least every five years and to have unique plans for responding to oil spills in our coastal waters. Further, this bill will require the EPA to begin monitoring water quality within forty-eight hours after an oil spill is discovered. It is important for the public to have accurate information about how our water, our wildlife and our beaches are being affected as quickly as possible.

After finally stopping the flow of oil we now need to address the systematic breakdowns that led to the BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. The SAFEGUARDS Act presents commonsense solutions to help prevent a disaster of this magnitude from ever happening again, and improves the federal response in the event it ever does. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this measure. The Congress must get to work on oil spill response legislation; we owe it to the American people and the entire Gulf Coast.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN RAY MARTINI

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ray Martini, a World War II veteran and distinguished resident of Half Moon Bay, California.

Mr. Martini entered the European theater of war at age 23. In his five months of deployment, this young plumber accomplished extraordinary achievements. He arrived as a lieutenant in the Air Force and left as a Captain. He won an Air Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross and eleven Oak Leaf Clusters.

He flew over 50 bombing and strafing missions as a one-man crew of a Thunderbolt

Fighter. One of the challenges of these missions was the weather, as Captain Martini described in his letters from France: "It's the worst weather to fly in. We've lost four boys in bad weather flying . . . The weather man said the ceiling was 700 ft. but I believe he meant 70 ft. because as soon as we got air borne we lost sight of the ground. Well, we climbed up through the stuff and got above it a 5,000 ft. and proceeded to the target. Once over the target area it was clear. We bombed a rail bridge and knocked it out. Then started home. Well, over the base it was raining and we were flying right on the tree tops and could hardly see the ground. Lucky we found a field on the way home and we landed . . . That's the kind of weather we run into and lose good men in it. Sometimes we climbed from ground to 20,000 ft. in solid clouds before we break out of it. Boy, that's hard on your nerves."

In 1998 France allowed one of its highest honors to be awarded to Veterans from Allied Countries fighting in defense of France. Today, Mr. Martini receives the Medal of Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor by Deputy Consul General Mrs. Corinne Pereira.

After his military career, Mr. Martini returned to his trade as a plumber. For many years he ran "Reliable Plumbing" and he has trained just about every plumber on the coast.

Mr. Martini is the loving husband of Cathy Martini and proud father of his son, Mark Martini.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to rise with me to honor Captain Martini for his service to our country and our Allies on the day he receives the Medal of Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor, April 1, 2011.

INTRODUCING THE CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS NETWORK

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce several pieces of legislation to help restore the Chesapeake Bay. Marylanders have a strong tradition of environmental advocacy rooted in a passion for the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay is our Nation's largest estuary and, in many ways, the soul of my home state. It is a national environmental treasure and an economic catalyst for Maryland's tourism and seafood industries.

Unfortunately, the Bay's health has been negatively impacted by multiple factors, most notably nutrient runoff from our neighborhoods, farms and roadways. The legislation I am introducing today will help restore the Bay by enhancing outdoor recreation, improving access to the Bay, expanding environmental education, rehabilitating vital wetlands and providing incentives for citizens to make their homes more "Bay friendly."

The first bill would reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network (CBGN), a program that connects those who live in the Bay watershed to the natural, cultural and historic resources of the Bay and thereby encourages individual stewardship of these resources. This legislation is identical to the bill that passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote during the 110th and 111th Congresses. Since 2000, Gateways

has grown to include more than 150 sites and over 1500 miles of established and developing water trails in six states and the District of Columbia. Through grants to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife refuges, historic sites, museums, and water trails, the Network ties these sites together to provide meaningful experiences and foster citizen stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay. For a very modest investment, the Gateways program helps promote citizen stewardship that will be necessary to advance Bay cleanup and maintain the gains we hope to make in the coming years.

I am also introducing the Chesapeake Bay Science, Education and Ecosystem Enhancement Act of 2011, which reauthorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Chesapeake Bay Office that provides much of the scientific expertise to support Bay restoration. This legislation also authorizes NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Watershed Education and Training (BWET) program which provides environmental education grants in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Finally, the bill enhances the Chesapeake Bay Interpretative Buoy System (CBIBS), which provides vital scientific and historical information to boaters, scientists and teachers about conditions in the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Science, Education and Ecosystem Enhancement Act also passed the House of Representatives during the 111th Congress by a bipartisan vote.

The third bill would strengthen and expand the Army Corps of Engineers' role in Chesapeake Bay restoration—a mission they first began in 1996. It would provide the Corps with continuing authority to engage in this work; expand the Corps' work to all six states in the Bay watershed and the District of Columbia; and provide flexibility for the Corps to work with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and not-for-profit groups engaged in Bay cleanup. The Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, which was established in section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) in 1996, authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to provide design and construction assistance to state and local authorities in the environmental restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. These projects range from shoreline buffers to oyster reef construction.

The final piece of legislation is the Save the Bay Homeowner Act of 2011. This legislation would allow the 17 million citizens of the Chesapeake Bay watershed to become citizen stewards of the Bay and give them an active role in restoring it. The bill directs the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop a "Save the Chesapeake Bay Home" designation program that identifies various steps homeowners could voluntarily take around their property to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff and improve water quality in local streams and rivers that feed into the Bay. If a participating home meets certain standards, such as installing rain barrels or reducing fertilizer on their lawns, that home could be designated a "Save the Chesapeake Bay Home." The legislation further directs the EPA to give credit to states and local jurisdictions for nutrient and sediment level reduction based upon the number of homeowners that achieve the "Save the Chesapeake Bay Home" designation.

To truly save the Chesapeake Bay, we need the 17 million people who live in the Bay's wa-

tershed to become citizen stewards of the streams and rivers in their community. If each individual within the watershed were to contribute to clean-up efforts, even in small ways, the aggregate would yield significant results in moving Bay restoration forward.

Mr. Speaker, these four pieces of legislation will help improve the federal government's role in restoring the Chesapeake Bay. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting each of these pieces of legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE RIO GRANDE SAFE COMMUNITIES COALITION

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Rio Grande Safe Communities Coalition. The Coalition serves the Paso del Norte region which includes the City of El Paso, Texas, Southern New Mexico and Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico to build a safe drug-free environment for youth and adults. I want to honor the members of this Coalition for their tireless efforts in making a positive difference in our nation.

By implementing substance abuse preventative strategies within these communities, the Rio Grande Safe Communities Coalition helps individuals to avoid the negative consequences of drug and alcohol abuse. In order to do this effectively, the Coalition proactively identifies unsafe conditions in the community that contribute to the problem of substance abuse, and implements programs that aim to stop the behaviors creating these conditions. One such example is the Communities Against Reckless Endangerment or CARE initiative.

The CARE initiative was established in 2002 by the Coalition in response to troubling data from University Medical Center of El Paso and the El Paso Police Department regarding alcohol-related incidents among youth ages 12–17. The Coalition's response to this problem was to build a program that engages high school students to become part of the solution through peer-to-peer learning and educational awareness campaigns that warn of the dangers of substance abuse. Through this initiative, which was funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Program and monitored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, high school students created public service announcements and billboards aimed at preventing alcohol and drug abuse.

Since the establishment of the Rio Grande Safe Communities Coalition in 1999, there have been a number of initiatives to prevent and combat substance abuse. Initiatives include Operation B.R.I.D.G.E., which helped curb the problem of underage drinking by local teens who would cross into Mexico to consume alcohol, and the "DARE 2 CARE," campaign that placed warnings at convenience store windows and on alcohol packages throughout El Paso regarding unsafe and illegal consumption of alcohol.

The efforts of the Rio Grande Safe Communities Coalition have helped save the lives and improve the health of countless individuals in the community. Today, I am proud to recognize their efforts in improving the quality of life

for youth and adults living in the Paso del Norte region, and congratulate the Coalition for recently marking 10 years of community collaboration.

CENTER FOR MEDICARE
ADVOCACY'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Center for Medicare Advocacy's 25th anniversary and recognize their staff that has worked tirelessly on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries in Connecticut and around the country.

In 1986, the Center for Medicare Advocacy was founded in Mansfield, Connecticut by Judy Stein who has been a fierce advocate and leader for quality health care for Medicare beneficiaries. Over the past 25 years, Judy has transformed the Center into an unparalleled, national education and advocacy organization that supports Medicare beneficiaries. Today, the Center serves as an invaluable resource for our constituents and provides us with much needed, quality information on Medicare policies.

With a team of attorneys, nurses, legal assistants, and information management specialists, the Center for Medicare Advocacy works to provide assistance to seniors by simplifying Medicare policies and challenging the Medicare system to provide affordable quality health care with due process and rights of appeal. The Center offers consultations, training, and education to individuals and organizations in order to promote an affordable and fair Medicare system.

My colleagues and I owe Judy and the Center much gratitude for their vigilance of Medicare and the millions of beneficiaries it serves. It is my distinct pleasure to recognize their fine work and celebrate 25 years of service and many more to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF ABRAHAM
BREEHEY, 1976–2011

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform my colleagues that Abraham Breehey, Director of Legislative Affairs and Special Assistant to the International President of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, passed away yesterday, Thursday, April 14, 2011 at INOVA Fairfax Hospital, in Falls Church, Virginia, from complications related to a brain tumor and subsequent stroke.

Abe, only 34 years old, was born in 1976 in Binghamton, New York. He is survived by his wife, Sonya and beloved young daughter, Abigail, his father Ray, his mother Carol, his sister Rachel, 3 nieces, a nephew and, of course, his dog Kesey.

His death is a tragedy for his family and a loss for the working men and women of America on whose behalf he was so deeply committed.

Abe received his Bachelor's Degree from Siena College in Loudonville, NY and Master's Degree in Public Policy from the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy at the University of Albany. Prior to joining the Boilermakers in 2004, he served as Legislative Assistant for Representative LLOYD DOGGETT (TX–25).

Abe was a leading voice in the labor movement, representing the Boilermakers on issues related to energy policy and climate change, and their impact on workers. He was widely respected for his passion, intellect, and ability to build consensus across ideological and political lines.

Abe has testified in front of multiple U.S. Senate Committees and represented the Boilermakers in international negotiations regarding the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Abe also advised the AFL–CIO Building and Construction Trades Department as Chairman of the Department's Legislative Task Force.

And Abe is a graduate of the Trade Union Program at Harvard Law School.

A staunch advocate on behalf of every Boilermaker member, Abe was a colleague and a friend to each of us.

My thoughts and prayers are with the entire Breehey family. I hope they receive a small degree of comfort in knowing that Abe was so well liked and so well respected in his professional world.

HONORING CERRITOS
COUNCILMEMBER LAURA LEE

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Laura Lee for her 8 years of public service to the people of Cerritos, California.

Laura and her husband Charles have called Cerritos home since 1979 and raised their two talented children in the city. Prior to her election to the Cerritos City Council in 2003, Laura had been an active member of the community and served as a city planning commissioner from 1999 to 2001. As a testament to her leadership, the residents of Cerritos elected Laura to serve the maximum amount of terms, fulfilling the duties of Mayor once and Mayor Pro Tempore twice.

Throughout her tenure on the Cerritos City Council, Laura worked tirelessly with her fellow councilmembers to launch the city to new heights. During Laura's tenure on the city council, Cerritos experienced unmatched growth, including the addition of a fitness center at the city's Senior Center, the erection of a beautiful sculpture garden, and the construction of the Fountain Walk senior housing community.

Under 2008, with Laura's leadership, the City of Cerritos received the prestigious All-America City Award. Laura also worked to ensure Cerritos remains a place where small businesses thrive, helping the City to earn "Most Business-Friendly City in Los Angeles County" recognition by the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation.

Laura's passion for serving others extended well beyond her Council duties. She has

served as director of the American Red Cross Long Beach Chapter Board, advisor of the Su Casa Domestic Abuse Network, director general of the Southern California Chinese Women's League, and a steadfast volunteer at the Cerritos Senior Center. A real estate broker by trade, Laura has also led the Rancho Southeast Association of Realtors as president and served as chairwoman of the Equal Opportunity and Cultural Diversity Committee of the California Association of Realtors.

Perhaps Laura's most profound contribution to Cerritos is her immeasurable kindness and compassion. Her heart has always made certain her decisions at the City Council dais were generous as well as pragmatic. Her smile is ever present and exemplifies the city's vibrancy. It is with great pleasure that I commend Laura for her dedication to public service and leadership by example.

INTRODUCTION OF THE
CHILDREN'S BUDGET ACT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Forest Witcraft is reported to have said, "A hundred years from now it will not matter what my bank account was, the sort of house I lived in, or the kind of car I drove, but the world may be different because I was important in the life of a child." Children make up one-quarter of our population, and they form the foundation of our nation's future. Every parent hopes that their children will fare better than they did—achieve more, experience greater success, and realize the American Dream more fully. As policymakers, we have the ability and responsibility to provide a strong foundation for our youngest citizens to grow into the achievers and leaders of tomorrow.

Today, I introduce the Children's Budget Act. It is a bill that is simple in concept—require the President to provide a detailed account of all the Federal funding for children and children's programs. What funding do we actually spend on children? Are we properly addressing the national needs and problems confronting children? Accounting for Federal dollars in this way will help us understand how well we are making the health and well-being of our children a national priority.

Currently, even experienced policy analysts have a difficult time determining how much the government invests in children, and therefore how the needs of our children might better be addressed. A few independent groups—such as First Focus, the Brookings Institution, and the Urban Institute—have worked to understand the Federal investment in our children. It is only through their efforts that we have been able to comprehend how recent Federal funding choices have affected children. For example, the children's advocacy group First Focus recently commissioned a report by the Urban Institute to detail how Federal spending on children has changed over the past 45 years. The results of the Kids Share report were startling. In 1960, the children's share of Federal domestic spending—tax policies included—was 20.1 percent. In 2009, that share had declined to 14 percent—a 30.3 percent overall decline. Together, the Democratically-

controlled 111th Congress and the President substantially increased funding for children by \$25 billion. The President's FY11 Budget proposed important increases of \$6.2 billion in children's spending. In contrast, the Republican FY12 Budget proposal would eliminate all gains from the last several years. To illustrate, the Ryan Budget would create a \$150 billion funding gap in the Children's Health insurance program between 2014 and 2021, resulting in an 80 percent hole in the CHIP program and a loss of coverage for approximately 7 million children. Similarly, children bore 22 percent of the cuts in the second Continuing Resolution this year.

If children are a national priority, we need to measure our Federal spending so that we can understand if our choices disproportionately harm or protect our children. Without this analysis, policymakers and the public are limited in our ability to know how children fare in funding proposals. I strongly believe the Federal Government should embrace examining our Federal budget by our investment in children. Already, there are several State and local governments who produce a children's budget annually, including Louisiana, Ohio, the District of Columbia, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Oregon, and the Cities of Philadelphia and San Francisco. These budgets provide invaluable sources of information that help us understand whether we are meeting our goals for children. Precedent already exists for examining the Federal budget based on key areas of interest, including spending on programs related to homeland security, meteorology, climate, and drug control. By creating a children's budget at the Federal level, we can bring a renewed attention to children's issues and programs and guarantee a fair look at our national investment priorities.

A Children's Budget is critical now more than ever, with so many of our children and youth bearing the brunt of our Nation's economic hardship. In 2009, 20.7 percent of children and 23.8 percent of children under age 6 lived below the poverty line in our Nation. My Congressional District—the Seventh District of Illinois—had a staggering 35.5 percent poverty rate among children in 2009. These statistics reflect the need for a children's budget so that policymakers and voters understand whether our investments match the needs of our Nation's youngest citizens.

As our Nation continues to face difficult economic times, we should be able to answer the fundamental question "Is it good for the children?" The Children's Budget Act would ensure that children are given due consideration whenever the budget is discussed and would provide policymakers, program administrators, and parents with a clear picture of the overall Federal investment in our children. Careful analysis of our spending today helps us improve our efforts for tomorrow. The well-being of our children should be at the top of our national agenda. I hope my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this important legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL P. MURPHY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the retirement of Mike Murphy, the San Mateo County Counsel.

I had the great privilege to work with Mike when I was a member of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. He is an exceptional public servant, legal expert, human being and a dear friend.

Mike was born in Yokohama, Japan on November 17, 1948 as the son of a military family. He went to Pacific Grove High School from where he graduated in 1966. He then attended the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and graduated in 1970. He later served on the Military Academy Advisory Committee.

Mike laid the ground work for his legal career at Boalt Hall School of Law at UC Berkeley. He graduated in May of 1978 and just six months later was admitted to the California Bar.

In May of 1982, Mike started serving in the office of the San Mateo County District Attorney. In 1987, the civil division of the office became the San Mateo County Counsel where Mike continued to serve. He was appointed one of two Chief Deputies in 1998 and Assistant County Counsel in 2006. In 2007, he became Counsel until his retirement on March 18, 2011.

Mike served as the principal land use attorney for 22 years, a pressure cooker of a job that he made appear effortless. Among his highest achievements were the defense of the County's Local Coastal Program and Measure A, a coastal protection initiative and the defense of Measure T, authorizing the Devil's Slide tunnel bypass. During his entire career, Mike worked as a legal advisor on the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan, a landmark environmental document that he demonstrated his legal skill in drafting.

In 1988, Mike and San Mateo County celebrated a true David vs. Goliath victory. The Port of Oakland was about to dump 7 million tons of dredged spoils into the ocean off the San Mateo coast. The Half Moon Bay Fishermen's Marketing Association filed a lawsuit to stop the dumping but lost in federal court. Mike and his colleague Stephen Toben studied the case and filed a suit for injunctive and declaratory relief. It was their legal expertise and perseverance that resulted in a victory in front of the California State Court of Appeals.

While I was in the California Senate in 2003, Mike defended my financial privacy legislation and faced strong opposition from multinational conglomerates. Again, his outstanding legal acumen succeeded in protecting the rights of San Mateo County residents.

Mike has also been serving on the Military Academy Advisory Committee for the 12th Congressional District for many years, helping select the next generation of America's officers.

Mike is the loving husband of Gayle Murphy, his wife of 28 years, and the proud parent of their two daughters Erin and Shannon.

In his well deserved retirement, Mike will undoubtedly enjoy the additional time he will have to read and attend San Francisco Giants games.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to rise with me to honor an extraordinary man, Mike Murphy, for his dedication to public service and justice in San Mateo County.

CELEBRATION OF ANTIQUE TRACTOR PRESERVATION DAY

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the celebration of Antique Tractor Preservation Day in West Plains, Missouri. West Plains, Missouri represents a growing community that is creating a new tradition for tractor enthusiasts across the country.

Antique tractors and farm machinery serve as a reminder of a key part of our nation's agricultural heritage. Antique Tractor Preservation Day provides an opportunity to display these tractors in a venue where enthusiasts can share their stories with one another. Enthusiasts who share this common interest can share their passions for buying and restoring Antique Tractors.

Antique Tractor Preservation Day also provides others, who might not be enthusiasts, an opportunity to learn more about agricultural history and to better understand and appreciate the significant advancements American agriculture has made over the last century. It is important to carry on this legacy by preserving our antique tractors for generations into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Michael Hinton and the West Plains community for their work in creating an opportunity for enthusiasts to come together and to celebrate this proud heritage and rich history.

TRASH REDUCTION ACT OF 2011

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, our 308 million American citizens throw away nearly 496 billion pounds of trash each year, a staggering amount by any analysis. And a sizable contribution is from disposable items, including plastic and paper bags. That's why today I am introducing the "Trash Reduction Act of 2011" along with my co-sponsor, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. We're asking for your support in moving this bill favorably through the House.

Just how bad is the problem? According to the U.S. EPA, the average American throws away about 4.4 pounds of trash each day or 1,600 pounds per year. That's nearly 248 million tons of American garbage each year. To put that in perspective, it's enough trash to fill a football-field-sized hole over 93 miles deep. Or create a similar-sized stack of garbage that reaches low earth orbit. This amount of trash could cover the state of Texas two and half times or fill enough trash trucks to form a line to the moon.

We consume an estimated 12 million barrels of oil and copious amounts of natural gas annually to make plastic bags that are used once

or twice, then tossed into the garbage. The U.S. International Trade Commission reported in 2009 that 102 billion plastic bags were used in the U.S. Much of the oil and natural gas used in those bags comes from foreign countries and it's all non-renewable. Once it's used for plastic bags and thrown away, that energy is gone forever.

Disposable paper bags are no better. In 1999, 14 million trees were cut to produce the 10 billion paper grocery bags used by Americans that year alone. Paper and paperboard products made up 20.7% of the municipal waste discarded in 2008—more than any other type of refuse measured by tonnage. According to the Environmental Paper Network, the pulp and paper industry is the fourth largest emitter of greenhouse gases among manufacturing industries, contributing 9% of total manufacturing-related carbon dioxide emissions. Most of energy use comes from powering paper mills.

There is no doubt that disposable retail plastic and paper bags are bad for the environment. Both paper and plastic bags consume valuable natural resources, generate profuse waste, and pollute the environment. They keep us dependent on nonrenewable resources like foreign oil and impose burdens that Americans bear in the form of higher garbage costs, visual blight, and the destruction of wildlife. Millions of animals are entangled in or ingest plastic waste. That same waste leaches toxins into the ground and our drinking water.

While recycling efforts should be applauded, recycling rates are dismally low. Only between one and three percent of all plastic bags are recycled, with a slightly higher ten to 15 percent paper-bag-recycling rate. Plus, the recycling process uses energy, water, and generates additional greenhouse gasses.

But we can do something about this gargantuan garbage nightmare. We can reduce the number of bags we use with market-based incentives. Requiring shoppers to internalize the costs of disposable bags has been shown to dramatically reduce their use and substantially increase reusable bag utilization. For example, after placing a fee on plastic bags, Ireland reportedly reduced consumption by 90%. China, after banning the use of ultra-thin plastic bags, is estimated to have eliminated 40 billion bags in the first year.

Critics have called this a regressive tax that falls on poor communities. This is simply untrue. Wealthy Americans consume substantially more resources and disposable shopping bags than the poor. Additionally, Americans of all incomes can purchase or be given a reusable bag and avoid this fee altogether. Plus, this fee is good for business. Business will be able to recoup their investment of time and effort through a tax credit and profits from reusable bag sales.

One need look no further than the District of Columbia to measure success. In 2009 the District imposed a five-cent tax on plastic bags that led to spectacular reductions in disposable bag use. The number of plastic bags dropped from the 2009 monthly average of 22.5 million to just 3 million per month by the end of 2010. River cleanup volunteers reported over a 60% decrease in the volume of plastic bags they collected during cleanup activities—and this was only three months after the fee took effect.

DC businesses approve of the fee as well. 78% of businesses interviewed report either a

positive or neutral impact on their business. People keep shopping and keep buying. 58% of DC business owners say the law has not affected their sales. And it's those dire predictions of falling sales that were used to scare business owners into opposing the fee. It's one of the many false predictions of bag-fee opponents.

While we can be proud of our environmental achievements and landmark laws, we need to do more to reduce our mountains of trash madness. Nothing is more fitting for this year's Earth Day celebration than helping reduce garbage.

This small disposable bag charge helps people understand that paper and plastic bags are not without cost. They impact the environment, support foreign dictators, and make Everests of trash. Our bill begins to shift America away from its current disposable culture back to a simpler time when Americans understood the value of reusing what they bought.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, Congressman PAUL RYAN's budget goes beyond what is necessary to restore fiscal solvency. It unfairly targets our nation's low income communities and senior citizens, while protecting the interests of the wealthiest Americans.

My colleague's budget, which has been embraced by his party returns to the "trickle down" economics that contributed to the recent recession by cutting the tax rate for the wealthiest individuals and corporations from 35 to 25%.

This ten percent decrease represents \$800 billion dollars in new tax cuts for the wealthiest among us at a time when so many are struggling. The \$800 billion in tax cuts represents \$115 billion dollars cut from healthcare, \$119 billion from income security, \$223 billion from education, job training and social services, and \$276 billion dollars in cuts to transportation initiatives that provide jobs.

There is absolutely no justification for these huge tax cuts. The wealthiest tax brackets should not profit at the expense of programs keeping struggling families from poverty.

The Economic Policy Institute states that "A study just released by the Heritage Center for Data Analysis projects that The Path to Prosperity [Republican Budget Plan] will help create nearly one million new private-sector jobs next year, bring the unemployment rate down to 4% by 2015, and result in 2.5 million additional private-sector jobs in the last year of the decade." This is an overwhelmingly presumptuous estimation.

Unemployment fell to 4% for only one relatively brief episode in recent memory, and

that was after nearly a decade of strong economic growth. So the Heritage Center's claim is very bold.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the unemployment rate will be 5.9% in 2015. The Heritage Center's forecasts for the Ryan plan are even bolder in the out years: It predicts unemployment will fall to an unprecedented 2.8% by 2021. Simply put, this is incredible and wholly unrealistic.

The Economic Policy Institute calls "the Ryan budget a job killer," and goes on to say, "The chances that this plan would drive the U.S. economy to 2.8% unemployment are near zero, but the chances of it repeating the mistakes of the Bush tax cuts and driving the economy into a ditch are very real."

The Republican's 2012 budget cuts \$2 trillion dollars more than President Obama's Debt Commission advised, and those cuts come from vital social services and safety nets for low income families, children and seniors.

Since 1965, Americans have relied on the Federal government to provide healthcare security. The changes and cuts to Medicare proposed in this budget deeply threaten the security of our senior citizens. The proposed repeal of guaranteed eligibility means that Americans who are 54 years old today will not be guaranteed to receive Medicare when they turn 65.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these changes to Medicare will triple the cost for new beneficiaries by 2030 and increase costs for current recipients, including the 2.9 million people in Texas who received Medicare in 2010.

The Republican proposal will enact damaging changes to Medicaid, threatening healthcare resources for the 60 million people, half of them children that rely on this program to stay healthy. A block grant for funding or a cap on federal Medicaid spending would increase the cost for states and the low income families who benefit from the program.

Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,000 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare under this budget.

Changes to Medicaid advocated by Republicans would be devastating to senior citizens who rely on the Medicaid safety net for long term care and nursing home costs not covered by Medicare. The AARP estimates cutting this safety net would put 54,000 Texas nursing home residents in jeopardy.

The Majority party's budget cuts do not just impact those who rely on Medicaid and Medicare; they also prevent 32 million Americans from obtaining health insurance under the Affordable Care Act. By inserting a repeal of this historic legislation into a budget, Republicans threaten millions seeking insurance, including the 6.2 million Texans who do not have health care coverage.

Underserved and low income Americans will see deep cuts to the programs that keep them safe and healthy, like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which provides food assistance to 44.3 million people, would be transferred to a block grant under the Republican plan. Shifting the cost to the states would force them to cut benefits to current recipients or create a waiting list of families that can't afford food on their own. This

would certainly harm the 554,000 people in Harris County receiving SNAP benefits in December of 2010.

This legislation would cut Federal housing aid, and impose unfair work or job training requirements that give no consideration to job market diversity or extenuating circumstances. It will also deeply reduce the LIHEAP contingency fund will affect the 500,000 low income households in Houston that were receiving heating and energy discounts last year.

Republicans may be willing to pass a budget that reduces Pell Grants by 60%. They may be comfortable eliminating \$75 million dollars to provide housing and other services to homeless veterans, but I cannot support a budget that leaves so many Americans behind.

In order to move America forward, we must give all citizens equal opportunity for success. We must invest in future generations by funding education and job training programs, not cutting this funding by \$250 billion dollars. We need to invest in clean energy, and environmentally sound technology that will foster job growth, and continue to improve our infrastructure.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND
FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern regarding the partisan direction our budget debate has taken this week. Although there is near unanimous agreement that we must reduce our deficit, there has been no productive discussion in this chamber as to how we can work together to accomplish that goal. We all have our own ideas about our nation's fiscal priorities, but what is missing in today's discussion is a bipartisan, centrist approach to addressing our nation's fiscal health, such as the recommendations in the report by the Simpson-Bowles National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform.

It is unfortunate that the House will not consider the Cooper amendment, mirroring the Simpson-Bowles suggestions, as an alternative to the extreme partisan proposals that have been put forth. Responsibly reducing our nation's deficit will require shared sacrifice and bipartisan consensus, and will not be accomplished if the two parties are unable to work together.

In March, I joined with my colleagues in the Blue Dog Coalition to offer a comprehensive and aggressive set of benchmarks for fiscal reform that include the largest deficit cuts in history by 2014, entitlement and tax reform, and a reduction in the overall size of government. This proposal put everything on the table, cutting the deficit by \$4 trillion dollars over the next 10 years, returning to 2008 spending levels by 2013, and addressing entitlement programs.

No one party has all the answers, and no one party can do this alone. It's time to put our economy back on the path to fiscal sustainability, and this House should consider the Simpson-Bowles recommendations that aim to accomplish that goal.

HONORING MRS. NORA LEE ADAMS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, One hundred years ago a virtuous woman of God was born in Houston County, Georgia on April 15, 1911; and

Whereas, Mrs. Nora Lee Adams moved to Dooly County, Georgia, where she married Mr. Henry Adams and through their union was blessed with 12 children, 27 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and 31 great-great grandchildren; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman has shared her time and talents as a wife, mother and motivator, giving the citizens of Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of others; and

Whereas, Mrs. Adams has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Mrs. Adams, along with her family and friends, is celebrating this day a remarkable milestone, her 100th birthday, we pause to acknowledge a woman who is a cornerstone in our community in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Adams on her birthday and to wish her well and recognize her for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR. do hereby proclaim April 15th, 2011 as Mrs. Nora Lee Adams Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 15th day of April, 2011.

IN RECOGNITION OF RACHEL
ANDRES

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rachel Andres, the 2011 San Mateo County Teacher of the Year.

At a time when our country lags behind other nations in math and science achievement instruction, Rachel Andres has established a teaching approach in high school that is slashing the math gap. In her own words: "I respect my students and listen to the voice of each one, but then I set high standards, challenge each one to excel, provide the necessary support and require that they take responsibility for learning and be accountable for demonstrating master." She is clearly a task master with compassion.

Rachel earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree with a double major in Mathematics and Secondary Education from Lake Forest College in Illinois. After teaching four years at Winthrop High School in Massachusetts, she accepted her current position at Menlo-Atherton High School in 2005. She teaches Geometry and other math classes.

She is the coordinator of her school's effort to prepare students for college. In fact, she speaks at middle-schools for the purpose of attracting incoming freshmen to what is called the Advancement Via Individual Determination

program. She meets with parents and nurtures partnerships with local Boys and Girls Clubs and recruits tutors all in the name of nurturing a college-going culture in the community. Most significantly, a high percentage of students in the program are successful in becoming the first in their family to attend college.

Further, Rachel has expanded learning boundaries for her students through creative curriculum development. For example, she has designed strategies to enable students to use writing as a means to solve math problems. While her teaching has been recognized with local awards, she is quick to say that the most important recognition comes from students who thank her for helping them succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to rise with me to honor a teacher who has raised the bar of excellence in the classroom. Our country simply needs more math teachers like Rachel Andres.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR FLIGHT OF
OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 27 World War II veterans of Oregon who will visit their memorial here in Washington, DC, later this month. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome the Honor Flight of Oregon.

The following are the distinguished veterans who will be representing the Honor Flight of Oregon: Elbert Bales, Donald Cameron, Kenneth Deacon, Henry Dorig, Robert Eddings, Noel Eng, William Grisso, Paul Potts, Eugene Sheffler and Harold Weigand, U.S. Navy; Ruth Waldruff, U.S. Marine Corps; Calvin Clayton, Stephen Graves, Warren Lancaster, John Lortz, John Mast, Laurel McClelland, Hans Running, Donald Smith and Don West, U.S. Army; John Couch, Calvin Hanscom, Jerry Johnson and James Johnson, U.S. Army Air Corps; Barbara Euler and Baldwin Thurman, U.S. Women's Army Corps; Shirley Marcy, U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps.

Mr. Speaker, these 27 veterans from Oregon are joining a camaraderie of over 63,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have been transported from their home states to our nation's capital at absolutely no cost to them or their families, to visit and reflect at memorials built here in their honor.

The fact that these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines would uproot themselves from their homes and families and put themselves in harm's way for our country is very humbling. The debt of gratitude we owe them can never be repaid, for without their honor, courage, commitment, and—above all—sacrifice we would not be able to enjoy the freedoms we have today.

Please join me in thanking these Oregon veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their dedication, commitment, and service to this great nation.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF
HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, with Mr. Terry in the chair.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget plan.

The federal budget should reflect the priorities and values of our nation, but the Republican plan instead looks out for the likes of big corporations who would get enormous tax breaks. What's more, the Republicans are asking America's seniors to pay for it. In fact, the Republican budget would end Medicare as we know it. And it would devastate Medicaid. Moreover, the Republican budget hurts our economy and in particular investments in innovation.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget proposal will severely unravel our nation's gains in the clean energy economy. At the same time, it proposes significant tax subsidies for Big Oil. There is something not right with that picture. In fact, I believe the Republican budget is severely short-sighted. It offers our competitors, China and Germany, a free-pass to dominate an ever-growing clean energy manufacturing economy and job creation.

The Sacramento area has over 220 clean energy companies, and I can tell you that many of those small business CEOs are seeking continued investment and support from this Congress.

Mr. Chair, we should be promoting policies like the Make It in America agenda to boost America's manufacturing industry and make products here this country. In order for America to remain competitive, innovative, and a global leader, we must make responsible choices.

Unfortunately, the Ryan budget does not. I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided Republican budget plan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote No. 270 for H. Con. Res. 35. If I were here, I would have voted "yea."

INTRODUCTION OF THE
SUPERFUND REINVESTMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the "Superfund Rein-

vestment Act" along with my colleagues Rep. FRANK PALLONE and TIMOTHY BISHOP. This legislation will provide resources to communities across the country to clean up hazardous waste sites and at the same time will save taxpayers more than \$20 billion over 10 years.

The Superfund program was enacted in 1980 to provide money to clean up toxic waste sites where the responsible party was out of business or could not be identified. Before they expired in 1995, the money for Superfund cleanup came from taxes on the polluters themselves. However, Congress has never reauthorized the tax, making the burden of funding cleanups of toxic waste sites fall on the shoulders of taxpaying Americans. It is time to make public health, not protection for polluters, a priority.

This legislation will simply reinstate the Superfund taxes to their previous levels. This includes excise taxes of 9.7 cents per barrel on crude oil or refined oil products, excise taxes of \$0.22 to \$4.87 per ton on certain chemicals, and a corporate income tax of 0.12 percent on the amount of a corporation's modified alternative minimum taxable income that exceeds \$2 million. The President's FY 2012 budget, which calls for reauthorization of these taxes, estimates that these fees would raise about \$2 billion per year and \$20.8 billion over 10 years.

Superfund sites are some of the most contaminated in the nation. 70 million Americans—including 10 million children, live within four miles of a Superfund site. They are exposed to toxic waste such as arsenic, benzene, PCBs, mercury and a range of solvents, leading to health problems such as infertility, low birth weight, birth defects, leukemia and respiratory difficulties. Communities home to these sites can face restrictions on water use and recreational activities as well as economic losses as property values decline due to contaminated land.

My community of Portland, Oregon, has been struggling to clean up one of the nation's most complex Superfund sites, the Portland Harbor site on the Willamette River. I hope that this bill to reinvest in the Superfund program will provide additional resources to the Environmental Protection Agency to keep the cleanup on track.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 34, the FY 2012 Budget Resolution. Instead of having the wealthiest pay their fair share, this budget just helps the "haves" at the expense of everyone else.

The Republican majority has brought this bill to the floor for a vote today, claiming that this budget will resolve our fiscal crisis and lead our country back on the "path to prosperity." Sadly, this path to prosperity only applies to those who already have a lot and don't need more. Millionaires and billionaires will like the tax breaks that they'll get from this budget. The wealthiest Americans will get the Bush tax cuts permanently extended to the tune of \$1 trillion. Big Oil companies will get tens of billions of dollars in subsidies. Special interests that send jobs overseas will also like this budget's tax giveaways.

What should scare us most about this FY2012 budget is that it pays for all of these tax breaks—over \$4 trillion in tax cuts—on the backs of working and middle-class people. It asks those who are struggling the most to sacrifice even more.

The recession has increased the child poverty rate in Hawaii to its highest level in years. This reverse Robin Hood budget would drastically cut food programs for poor children, Head Start, and child care for working families. Today, my staff and I are fasting in solidarity with the 50 million people in America who don't know where their next meal is coming from. HungerFast.org is coordinating this effort with over 30,000 people, including Members of Congress, Ambassador Tony Hall, faith leaders, MoveOn and SEIU members, Moby, and others.

H. Con. Res. 34 ends Medicare as we know it. All of you under the age of 55 will not be able to enroll in the original Medicare program. In Hawaii, the under-55 population is slightly less than a million. When you are age 67—yes, that's right, Republicans are raising the Medicare enrollment age by two more years—you will receive a voucher that you will use to buy insurance from a private company. We don't know what the amount of the voucher will be or whether it will keep up with the rising costs of health care. This scheme privatizes Medicare.

You're 67 years old. Is trying to buy health insurance with your voucher what you want to be doing? Every year? And who knows if the doctor you like is even going to participate in your private insurance plan. One thing is for certain—privatizing Medicare will mean more business for the insurance companies.

The Republican plan doesn't take on the 48 million Americans already on Medicare or those that will enter the program in 10 years because the Republicans know that this voucher plan would make these seniors mad as hell. Many of you have parents on Medicare. My mom is on Medicare. Without Medicare, we would be worried sick about how our parents will pay for health care.

Before Medicare became law in 1965, half of all seniors had no health insurance. The Republican budget is not only out of step with the priorities of the nation, but it is also a step backwards when it comes to health care for those who need it the most.

This budget also takes away important health care reform benefits for seniors who are already on Medicare. It repeals the gradual elimination of the Medicare "donut hole" in prescription drug coverage. It also repeals free access to key preventive services and annual checkups. Over 48 million seniors with Medicare, including 208,500 in Hawaii, would have to pay more if they want to stay healthy by getting regular check-ups.

Another group most in need of medical care in our country—the poor—would see cuts of about \$771 billion from Medicaid over 10 years. Medicaid would be converted into a block grant program, which won't reflect the actual need for Medicaid services. Converting Medicaid into a fixed funding stream would raise the cost of nursing home care for millions of families, potentially reducing the quality of care. It would also impact seniors and disabled individuals who want home- or community-based support as opposed to expensive institutional care.

Seventeen governors, including our former colleague and now Governor of Hawaii Neil Abercrombie, have written to the Speaker in opposition to the Republican plan to block grant Medicaid. They know that this would place an unfair burden on the cost of health care on the states. Under the Republican plan, Hawaii alone would lose \$2.8 billion in federal Medicaid dollars over 10 years. This means that 29,600 seniors could lose their Medicaid coverage or see reduced benefits due to the proposed Republican cut, resulting in 161,500 children losing their Medicaid coverage.

In addition to the problematic changes that this budget makes to Medicare and Medicaid, this short-sighted budget prevents us from investing in our workforce and growing our economy. The Republican budget cuts education and job training by more than 25 percent below current levels. Pell grants, funding for low-income elementary and secondary schools, and workforce training programs would be targeted for steep cuts. The bill also makes drastic cuts to local law enforcement and first responder programs at a time when many states, including Hawaii, are dealing with severe budget deficits.

This short-sighted budget also fails to invest in infrastructure or create jobs in the transportation sector. While I'm working with my colleagues in the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to approve a new multi-year highway and transit program, this Republican budget withdraws about \$318 billion in resources from highway, transit, and other transportation initiatives over the next 10 years. In the meantime, commuters are paying higher gas prices at the pump, seeking alternative modes of transportation, and dealing with congestion on our nation's roads, which along with our public transportation, were given a grade of "D" by the American Society of Civil Engineers.

The resolution offered by the Republicans further fails to make critical investments in research and development (R&D) in science, health, and renewable energy, undermining our global competitiveness in R&D. Hawaii's families pay higher energy costs than anyone else in the country. Under this bill, oil companies can continue to get subsidies while making record profits. Funding for development of renewable energy sources is slashed by 60 percent, ensuring that we will remain dependent on imported fossil fuels and sending a signal to the markets that clean energy jobs are not a priority.

Instead of supporting the draconian cuts proposed by this Republican plan, I will vote for the fairer and more balanced plans proposed as alternatives to H. Con. Res. 34. These alternatives address our deficit in a more responsible way by assisting our most vulnerable during a time of fragile economic recovery. I will support investments that will

create jobs and ensure that our country remains the leader in innovation and the engine driving the global economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H. Con. Res. 34.

HONORING REVEREND OBBIE L. BURNS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Reverend Obbie L. Burns today begins a new chapter in his life and the life of New Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church in Lithonia, Georgia; and

Whereas, Reverend Obbie L. Burns under the guidance and favor of God, will this day be installed as Pastor of the New Macedonia Baptist Church and under his leadership he will be charged to pioneer and sustain New Macedonia Baptist Church, as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Reverend Burns is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our District and the world his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Reverend Obbie L. Burns on his installation as Pastor;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR. do hereby proclaim April 17, 2011 as Reverend Obbie L. Burns Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 17th day of April, 2011.

HONORING MS. ISABEL AFANADOR

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable woman, Ms. Isabel Afanador. Isabel Afanador was born in Bogota, Colombia. Quite accomplished, she has two Bachelor's degrees in Social Work, from the University Externado de Colombia and Florida International University. Additionally, she earned her Masters of Social Work from Florida International University.

Upon graduation in Colombia, she was hired as the Director of Social Services of Laminas del Caribe S.A.

In 1978, Isabel Afanador made South Florida her home. One year later she began to work for the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services as a caseworker in mental health. She was later promoted to the Program Manager position, which she held from 1988 to 1994.

From 1995 to 1998 she was the Department of Children and Families District Licensing Coordinator, whose responsibility it was to en-

sure quality licensure of all residential providers and day care facilities.

In 1998, Isabel left the child welfare arena to work for the Department of Juvenile Justice, where for two years she managed an operational division responsible for intake, assessment, detention screening, and case management of the Miami-Dade district.

In August 2000, she was promoted to Chief Probation Officer for the Miami-Dade Juvenile Justice Program, and held the position of South Regional Director from 2008–2011.

Ms. Isabel Afanador has used her many talents and skills for the benefit of the community. This includes freely sharing her time serving with the Children's Trust Board, Neat Stuff board, Abriendo Puertas board, Youth Task Force board, Criminal Justice Council and a member of St. Brendan's Parish.

Mr. Speaker, I ask those present today to join me in honoring Ms. Isabel Afanador and commending her many achievements and service on behalf of the state of Florida.

HONORING STUDENT VETERAN AND COMMUNITY LEADER MATT RANDLE

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize former United States Army Combat Medic and current University of Arizona student Matt Randle.

Over the course of his career in the Army, Matt received two Army Commendation Medals, three Army Achievement Medals and two Good Conduct Medals for his service.

Following his distinguished service to our country Matt returned to his hometown of Tucson, Arizona and enrolled at the University of Arizona. Once on the UA campus, Matt began working with UA President Robert Shelton and his staff to develop and implement an initiative for returning veterans. I am proud to say that today the University of Arizona, located in my congressional district, has one of the most progressive and impressive veteran education and service models in the country including a student run veteran's office.

Matt's leadership has also played an integral role in the prosperity of the UA Veterans club. This club has received numerous awards including the "club" and "Philanthropic Group" of the year awards for the 2009–2010 academic school year on the UA campus and the Student Veterans of America "club of the year award."

Additionally, Matt will receive the UA's 2011 Robie Award which is issued to students who show personal integrity, initiative, cooperativeness, enthusiasm, humility, well-rounded interests, active participation in student affairs, service to the university and willingness to give more than required, and show a love of God and country. Thankfully, upon graduation Matt will not be leaving Tucson; he will be attending the University of Arizona Rogers College Of Law in the fall of 2011.

Each day more veterans return home from the Middle East conflicts. Matt Randle's ambition and leadership both at the UA and nationally will certainly be of great benefit to our returning veterans.

I am pleased to acknowledge and thank my constituent and friend, Matt Randle of the University of Arizona for his leadership, service and outstanding contributions to our community.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget. There are many reasons to oppose this budget.

Among them is the unconscionable provision that ends the Medicare guarantee of health care for our nation's seniors.

Since many of my colleagues have already spoken about the serious negative impact the Ryan Budget will have on Medicare, I will focus my comments on another egregious provision that unravels the Medicaid safety net.

The Republican budget before this House cuts support for seniors in nursing homes, disabled individuals and low-income children who depend on Medicaid.

This proposal to starve Medicaid of funds is nothing more than a heartless assault on America's poorest and most vulnerable—our children, seniors, the disabled and minority communities who rely on Medicaid for their health care.

Last year alone, 60 million Americans were served by Medicaid. Thirty million of those were children.

According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, if the Republican budget were to become law, states which are already buried in debt would face significant challenges in achieving enough cost savings to mitigate the loss of Federal funding.

As a result: states would likely begin to limit eligibility; Medicaid enrollees would have limited access to care and higher out-of-pocket costs and health care providers would lose money due to more uncompensated care and lost coverage.

In my district, where more than 250,000 residents are uninsured and tens of thousands more rely on Medicaid for their health care, this extreme Republican budget will be disastrous.

There are better and fairer ways to address our country's deficit that will protect the Medicaid safety net, create jobs, protect our seniors and invest in our children and the future of our country.

It is a mystery to me why Republicans are willing to fight to protect the tax cuts for big oil and the super wealthy and sacrifice millions of the poorest and most vulnerable Americans who will lose their medical and long-term care.

Democrats will fight to ensure this proposal is never enacted, and I encourage all my colleagues to oppose this cruel and shortsighted budget.

HONORING MRS. MARY KELLOGG BELL FOR HER DEDICATION TO HER FELLOW NORTH CAROLINIANS

HON. HEATH SHULER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Mary Kellogg Bell for a life dedicated to helping others in North Carolina.

Mary Bell was born on May 4, 1916. After graduating from the University of Georgia in 1937 with a degree in physical education, she worked as Head Counselor for Merrywood Camp for girls and in 1939, married her husband, Joseph Oscar Bell, Jr.

In 1951, Mrs. Bell founded the Glen Arden Camp for girls, which has enriched the lives of children around the country by exposing them to the natural beauty of Western North Carolina. In 1955, Mrs. Bell went on to become the first woman to serve on the Henderson County School Board. Mrs. Bell continues to volunteer as the Chair of the Welcoming Committee at her retirement home and helps organize transportation for retirees to get to the dialysis clinic.

It is an honor to represent selfless, hard-working citizens like Mrs. Mary Kellogg Bell. Her devotion is a great source of pride to me and to Western North Carolina. I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Mrs. Mary Kellogg Bell for her lasting impact on society.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF ABRAHAM BREEHEY

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Abraham Breehey, Director of Legislative Affairs and Special Assistant to the International President of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers. A loving father, husband, and friend, Abe passed away, at just 35, on Thursday, April 14, 2011, at INOVA Fairfax Hospital in Virginia from brain tumor complications.

Abe was born in 1976 in Binghamton, New York to Ray and Carol Breehey. He received his Bachelor's Degree from Sienna College in Loudonville, NY, his Master's Degree in Public Policy from the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy at the University of Albany, and graduated from the Trade Union Program at Harvard Law School. Prior to joining the Boilermakers in 2004, Abe served as Legislative Assistant for Representative LLOYD DOGGETT (TX-25).

Throughout his life, Abe championed fundamental labor rights. He represented the Boilermakers on issues regarding the effects of energy policy and climate change on workers. Abe also testified in front of multiple U.S. Senate Committees and represented the Boilermakers in international negotiations regarding the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. In addition, Abe advised the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Department as Chairman of the Department's Legislative Task Force.

Abe was a leading voice in the labor movement and was widely respected by his friends and colleagues. He was known for his passion, his warm personality, and his negotiating skill to merge both ideological and political goals into a practical solution.

Abe is survived by his wife, Sonya, his beloved daughter, Abigail, his father, Ray, his mother, Carol, and his sister, Rachel. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Breehey family. Abe was a good man who will be dearly missed by his family, friends, and the labor movement which he represented.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ABRAHAM BREEHEY, 1976-2011

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn that Abraham Breehey passed away yesterday from a brain tumor and stroke. Abe was the Director of Legislative Affairs and Special Assistant to the International President of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers. Abe also served as Chairman of the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Department's Legislative Task Force.

Abe was only 34 years old.

His death is a tragedy for his family and a loss for the working men and women of America on whose behalf he was so deeply committed.

I share in sadness and reflection with Hawaii's members of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Locals 90 and 627.

It is always sad when we lose a labor leader, especially one so young and with such promise. I have been told that Abe was a passionate advocate for working people around the world. He was well-respected in the labor community for using his sharp intellect to build consensus across party lines.

Abe has testified in front of several U.S. Senate Committees, and he represented the Boilermakers in international negotiations on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

My thoughts and prayers are with the entire Breehey family and the U.S. labor movement.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL BILL WILLIAMS AND GEORGIA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM

HON. ROB WOODALL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Bill Williams and the Georgia Army National Guard Agricultural Development Team. Colonel Williams will be leading the Guard's Agricultural Development Team on a year-long deployment to Afghanistan at the end of April 2011. These brave citizen-soldiers are not only going into the theater to assist our men and women on the ground as they engage insurgents and terrorists but also

improve the lives of Afghani citizens. They will work to build an agricultural and irrigation system where local Afghani farmers can grow fruit and vegetables, raise livestock, and better manage limited water resources. Their efforts will create a stable, vital agricultural base and water resources system that can support the Afghani people and serve as a springboard for further economic growth in rural Afghan villages.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this kind of development and reconstruction. A stable, productive Afghani agricultural sector will be a counter-balance to the Taliban and the illicit production of opium, both of which are prevalent in rural parts of that nation and a threat to the security of the Afghan people and our military mission there. We have a chance to counteract these activities by collaborating with the Afghani people to find the tools and the seeds to grow their own democracy. In partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Georgia Army National Guard will also deliver clean water to more and more Afghani communities. By simply treating and transporting clean water to these communities, we will dramatically improve the health of the overall population, helping to win the hearts and minds of the Afghani people.

We have a real chance to turn the tide, and the Georgia Army National Guard Agricultural Development Team will continue that fight. I am so proud to see our Georgia military men and women meeting this challenge and leading the effort in the coming year to further transform Afghani society. It is my hope that through the work of the Agricultural Development Team and their Afghani partners, Afghanistan will develop an agrarian foundation that will not only bear food, but also the fruits of liberty, prosperity, and security in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Georgia Army National Guard Agricultural Development Team for their outstanding service to our country and for their commitment to growing the seeds of democracy. May God bless them on their mission in Afghanistan and return them safely home.

TAIWAN F-16 SALES

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time friend of Taiwan and as a Member of Congress who has frequent interaction with Taiwanese American constituents, I rise today to bring a timely issue to your attention.

My support for Taiwan, and especially for arms sales to Taiwan, is well-known and well-documented. As a matter of fact, I inserted a statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last spring calling for the expedient sale of F-16s to Taiwan.

Recently, I read an article in the Taipei Times that left me rattled.

On February 20, 2011, the director of the American Enterprise Institute's Program on Advanced Strategic Studies, Mr. Gary Schmitt, wrote in the Taipei Times, "When your girlfriend refuses to set a date for a wedding, and does so over several years, it's probably a good idea to start looking around for another

fiancé. So it is today with Taiwan's efforts to procure more than five dozen F-16s from the U.S. This is a courtship from Taipei's end that has been going on since 2006. After nearly five years, it's time to consider moving on."

I believe it is critical that we do not drive Taiwan to the point where they have to start looking for fighters elsewhere. This situation is especially concerning because it will cost the U.S. jobs at a time when the domestic economy—particularly my home state of Texas—could use all the help it can get.

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget that today's Taiwan continues to be under an ominous shadow cast by the over 1,600 short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has aimed at it. The PRC continues to refuse to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, continues to claim Taiwan as a renegade province, and, to add insult to injury, passed an "Anti-Secession Law" on March 14, 2005, mandating military action if Taiwan moves toward formal de jure independence. We strongly condemned passage of this "Anti-Secession Law" when we passed House Concurrent Resolution 98 on March 16, 2005.

Section 3(a) and (b) of the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act, which is the cornerstone of United States-Taiwan relations and the law of the land, stipulates that both the President and the Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of defense articles and services that we are legally bound to provide to Taiwan, based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by urging my esteemed colleagues to join me in requesting the President move ahead with the sale of F-16s to Taiwan at this time.

TAXPAYER RECEIPT ACT OF 2011

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the recent months, taxes and spending have become a central topic in our national debate. How much federal income tax people pay and what those taxes pay for is not well understood by many Americans.

Very little information about how tax revenues are spent is ever made available to the American people. This results in significant misinformation. For example, a Washington Post and Kaiser Foundation poll found that by a margin of two to one, Americans believe that the federal government spends more on foreign aid than on either Social Security or Medicare. This is why I am reintroducing the Taxpayer Receipt Act of 2011. This bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to provide each taxpayer with a simple annual statement explaining how his or her federal income tax dollars were spent.

In the previous session I introduced this bill to bring transparency to government spending. Today, in tandem with the President's launch of the official federal taxpayer receipt, I will reintroduce this legislation to require by law that this critical information be provided to the American people for years to come.

The taxpayer receipt act provides an unbiased objective receipt that details federal

spending based on the same budget functions used in the appropriations process and rarely changed. This ensures accuracy and consistency from year to year, to ensure that the tax receipt is used to inform the American people objectively and not be used as a political document.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Information is the currency of democracy." To that end, providing Americans with information and transparency on government spending is essential to maintaining the strength and health of our democracy.

THE INDEMNIFICATION PROVISIONS OF THE DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, swap data repositories have the ability to provide regulators and markets with information on aggregate data positions that can assist them in evaluating and managing risk. However, that ability can be substantially diminished if important information is excluded from them. One risk of fragmentation or exclusion of data is if a country's laws in practice provide disincentives, or even prohibitions, to the sharing of such data to a repository located in another jurisdiction.

Sections 728 and 763 of the Dodd-Frank Act require that repositories obtain indemnifications from foreign regulators before sharing information with them. There was no legislative history behind this provision, which was incorporated late in the legislative process, without having been considered in the hearing process. As a result, it was not subject to extensive discussion and consideration prior to the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act, and its negative consequences must not have been clear to the conferees or the relevant regulatory bodies. I believe that the indemnification provision will significantly impede global regulatory cooperation.

Foreign regulators are not likely to grant Derivative Clearing Organizations, DCO's, or Swap Data Repositories, SDRs, indemnification in exchange for access to information. Accordingly, regulators may be less willing to access the aggregated market data, resulting in a reduction of information consumption, domestically and internationally, which jeopardizes market stability.

Further, the provision could have an immediate negative impact on the ability of U.S. regulators to obtain information from repositories located in foreign countries should reciprocal indemnification provisions be enacted in foreign laws. U.S. regulators, like foreign regulators, might be legally or practically precluded from signing such agreements.

This is not a theoretical concern. Just a few days ago in March, Jean-Paul Gauzes, a French Member of Parliament from the Conservative Party included in a package of 950 amendments put forth by the European Parliament to the European Commission language that would mirror the indemnification clauses in Dodd-Frank Act. The amendment was a deliberate response to the extraterritoriality provisions of "indemnity" contained in Dodd-Frank, and adoption of the package is anticipated in May of this year.

The proposed European language would require the United States government to indemnify EU trade repositories for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the information provided by the trade repository. The provision, which could well be adopted, has the potential to create numerous problems for the United States. For starters, it is not clear that U.S. regulators have the legal authority to enter into such an indemnification. Were they to do so, the indemnification becomes an invitation to such litigation by third-parties, domestic or foreign.

These problems mirror precisely the problems for EU governments created by the indemnification clauses in Dodd-Frank. In practice, while governments worked to address the issues raised by such requirements, the default position for any SDR would have to refuse to provide such information absent the indemnification, creating fragmentation and information gaps that could meaningfully harm global safety and soundness.

Preventing the exchange of information between regulators will frustrate efforts to mitigate international financial risk and fragment regulatory oversight on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

The goal is to ensure that in situations where foreign regulators are carrying out their regulatory responsibilities in a manner consistent with international agreements, which includes maintaining the confidentiality of data, can be appropriately exchanged without Sections 728 and 763 becoming an impediment to the goals of transparency and sound policy.

In light of the EU calendar on indemnification, swift action to prevent the unintended consequences of this inadequately considered provision of Dodd-Frank is needed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND
FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today's legislation is the eighth—and I hope final—Continuing Resolution the Congress as a whole will be considering this fiscal year.

Throughout this debate, I have rejected the false choice between deep cuts that harm our fragile economic recovery or shutting down the government. Rather, as Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, I have argued for a middle ground of graduated and predictable fiscal reform that both supports our recovery and reflects our values and priorities as a nation. In that regard, I am pleased that today's agreement reduces non-emergency outlays by only \$352 million for the rest of FY 2011—and then spreads the next \$20 billion in cuts over the next five years.

I have also made clear that our nation's fiscal imbalance cannot be addressed solely through reductions in the 12 percent of the budget representing non-security discretionary spending. Like the Bipartisan Fiscal Commission, I believe the final solution must include savings from our defense budget, adjustments to mandatory spending, and increased revenue. In my judgment, that revenue can and

should come from comprehensive tax reform that eliminates tax loopholes and reinstates the Clinton era marginal rates for upper income earners.

Mr. Speaker, to govern is to choose, and today's legislation contains choices I would not have made. For example, because I believe the United States should be second to none when it comes to medical and scientific research, I do not think it makes sense to cut \$260 million from the National Institutes of Health. Additionally, because our economy needs more clean energy, reducing energy efficiency and renewable energy research, development and deployment by \$407 million is a visible step in the wrong direction. Finally, because our nation deserves a 21st century infrastructure and the jobs that go with it, slashing nearly \$1 billion from the Clean Water and Drinking Water Revolving Funds is clearly misguided. In my view, medical research, clean energy and infrastructure are all examples of investments we can and should be willing to make in order to build a healthier, cleaner and stronger America.

While I am acutely aware of this bill's shortcomings, I also believe today's agreement contains some important victories. In a very challenging fiscal environment, we have been able to fund critical educational priorities. The Head Start program serving our youngest Americans will get a \$340 million increase, and the maximum Pell Grant award will be maintained at \$5500 so deserving low-income students can go to college. Additionally, with our unemployment rate at 8.8%, we have largely protected vital job training funds at a level of \$2.8 billion. Finally, while I do not believe the Republican party has any right to impose its ideological agenda on the District of Columbia, this bill eliminates the vast majority of extreme policy riders in HR 1 ranging from women's health to public broadcasting to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Law to the EPA's efforts to combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a far from perfect process, and not surprisingly, today's legislation is a far from perfect measure. But it is apparently the best we can do in this sharply divided Congress—and in the final analysis, I believe it is preferable to shutting down the government.

STATEMENT OF REP. EDWARD J.
MARKEY ON THE NINETY-SIXTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARME-
NIAN GENOCIDE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we remember and honor the victims of the Armenian Genocide, and we call, once again, for passage of a resolution affirming the Armenian Genocide in the U.S. Congress.

Between 1915 and 1923, a campaign conceived and executed by the Ottoman Empire forcibly deported nearly 2 million Armenians from their homes, resulting in the deaths of 1.5 million innocent children, women and men. The history surrounding this issue is abundantly clear—genocide did occur.

While the target of this campaign of extermination was the Armenian people, it was in-

deed a crime against all people—and we must not forget lest we let it happen again. On this day every year, communities across our nation and across the world come together to remember this great tragedy. On this day, we are all Armenians.

The term "genocide" had not yet been coined in 1915, when the first Armenians were driven from their homes. The definition of this most profound crime against humanity came in 1944 from Raphael Lemkin, a Polish Jew who survived the Holocaust by fleeing to America after the fall of Warsaw to the Nazis. In the wake of World War Two, Lemkin led the international community to establish the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. Lemkin's definitive example of genocide was the crimes against the Armenians.

And as we commemorate the Armenian Genocide, we must redouble our efforts to stop similar crimes being committed today. The scorched towns of Darfur, in western Sudan, continue to suffer mass murder, displacement, rape, and torture at the hands of the government and its militia allies. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, armed forces continue to target ethnic populations with abductions and violence, leading to more than 5.4 million civilian deaths in the past 15 years. And just weeks ago, the humanitarian group Doctors Without Borders was forced to suspend clinics in eastern Congo due to attacks from armed Congolese soldiers. These ongoing genocides must be stopped. Immediately.

In order to eliminate these genocides in the future, we must keep alive the memories of genocides past.

The U.S. House of Representatives has had before it, for many years now, a resolution which clearly affirms the United States record on the Armenian Genocide. I have been a strong supporter and vocal cosponsor of this resolution in every Congress, and I remain so today.

Last year, when the Foreign Affairs Committee voted in support of the resolution, Turkey recalled its Ambassador to the United States. Turkey's leaders continue to say that properly recognizing the Armenian Genocide will harm U.S.-Turkey relations—that it is not the right time to pass this resolution. But it is always "the right time" for the truth.

Already, 43 states and 20 nations have officially recognized the Armenian Genocide, and it is time for the United States to do the same. After all, how can we have the moral authority to call out and condemn the genocides in Darfur or Rwanda when we are unable to acknowledge the tragedy of Armenia? I look forward to the day that this truth can be spoken aloud, in one voice, by our government, and by governments around the world. Because it is the truth.

In 2009, the governments of Turkey and Armenia announced a roadmap for normalizing relations between the two countries. In a process brokered by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the two countries signed protocols to resume diplomacy and end the Turkish blockade of Armenia. However, before the ink had dried on those accords, the Turkish government backtracked on its commitment by adding additional preconditions.

The people of Armenia continue to face the devastating hardships wrought by the dual blockades of Turkey and Azerbaijan. These

blockades severely impede Armenia's ability to export goods, restricting the country's GDP by almost 40 percent of what it could be. In the face of these ongoing blockades, the United States must fully restore its economic aid to Armenia while working to reestablish the Turkish government's commitment to normalized relations.

Armenia has come a long way to free itself from terror and tyranny—free from the Ottoman Empire, free from the Soviet Union, and free from the horrors of the genocide that we remember every April 24th. This journey continues today, with our shared responsibility to ensure that the Armenian people are able to build their own, independent and prosperous future. If Armenians want to stay in Armenia and make a life there, they should be able to do so in peace and prosperity, and we should support them. And so, I look forward to continuing to work with the Armenian-American community and Members of the Congressional Caucus on Armenia to address the issues facing this longtime friend and important ally of the United States, so that together we can build something positive, something hopeful, something good for the future—an Armenia that is respected and honored by its allies and neighbors. And this cannot come without universal acknowledgement of the great humanitarian horror that was the Armenian Genocide.

Elie Wiesel once wrote, "A destruction, an annihilation that only man can provoke, only man can prevent." Nearly one century later, that is our responsibility—to remember the Armenian Genocide so that we can prevent such atrocities from happening again, and to continue standing together with the Armenian people in building a better future.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Resolution that is before the House today, H. Con. Res. 34. As a senior member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and as a Texan that cares deeply about adequately providing for our Nation's Transportation system, I cannot support the Republican Budget proposal that has been brought before us today.

I share my colleague's concern regarding our national debt but this irresponsible bill makes drastic cuts to our Nation's infrastructure that will harm the American economy in the long run. This bill cuts nationwide funding for highway, safety, and public transportation investments over the next six years from \$331 billion to \$219 billion.

This drastic cut of more than \$100 billion over six years of Highway funding means that the State of Texas alone will lose over \$1.9 billion in Highway funding at a time when revenue from the Highway Trust Fund is stretched thinner than ever.

Additionally, assuming the widely accepted 2007 Federal Highway Administration model that every \$1 billion of federal highway-aid in-

vestment creates or sustains 34,779 jobs over a seven-year period, this bill would destroy more than 490,000 jobs at a time when Congress should be helping grow and strengthen our economy, not stifling it as this Republican budget does.

I am proud to support the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget for 2012 that does honor our country's commitment to support and invest not only in transportation and infrastructure but also in education, job training, and research and development for Science and Technology.

I must emphasize that our future economic growth, and therefore our ability to reduce our debt in the future, is tied very strongly to the investments we make in science and innovation today.

Although the cuts to our Nation's Science programs are much less severe in the FY 2011 Continuing Resolution than H.R. 1, they still are damaging to our Science agencies, especially considering that current fiscal year is already half over.

Across the world, growth in jobs in Science and Technology are increasing at a high rate and America should be supplying an adequate education and training for talented people to enter these industries.

We are jeopardizing our country's future by threatening funding for programs which are helping American students develop the right combination of skills for these jobs.

Mr. Chair, we cannot afford to shut the doors on America's ability to compete in these growing industries and we cannot afford to stifle maintaining and growing our transportation system by neglecting much needed investment in these sectors. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative budget that is before us and reject the Republican budget that destroys jobs and is no plan for the future.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 34, Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate stands adjourned under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 43, until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 95 public bills, H.R. 1570–1664; 1 private bill, H.R. 1665; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 44–45; and H. Res. 229–235 were introduced. **Pages H2909–13**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2916–18**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Kingston to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2859**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H2901**

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 34, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and set forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, by a ye-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 193 noes, Roll No. 277. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, April 14th.

Pages H2861–62, H2862–70, H2870–H2901

Rejected:

Cleaver amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–62) that was debated on April 14th that sought to make significant investments in education, job training, transportation and infrastructure, and advanced research and development programs that will accelerate our economic recovery. Would also protect the social safety net without cutting Social Security, Medicaid or Medicare. Would raise new revenue by making our tax system more fair. Would also close certain corporate tax loopholes and preferences, which will save trillions of dollars on the deficit over the next decade (by a recorded vote of 103 yeas to 303 noes, Roll No. 273); **Pages H2861–62**

Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–62) that sought to eliminate the deficit by 2021, while putting America back to work, restoring America's economic competitiveness, implementing a fair tax system, keeping Americans healthy and bringing our troops back home (by a recorded vote of 77 yeas to 347 noes, Roll No. 274); **Pages H2862–70, H2882–83**

Garrett amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–62) that sought to establish a Fiscal Year 2012 budget and set the appropriate budgetary levels for Fiscal Year 2011 through 2021 (by a recorded vote of 119 yeas to 219 noes, Roll No. 275); **Pages H2862–70, H2882–83**

to 136 yeas with 172 voting “present”, Roll No. 275); and

Pages H2870–82, H2883–84

Van Hollen amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 112–62) that sought to reduce deficits gradually to avoid disrupting the recovery and reach primary balance by 2018 while protecting guarantees to seniors and investments that are essential for the well-being of our citizens. Would also make strategic investments in education, innovation, and infrastructure, while restraining the growth in overall discretionary spending. Would extend middle-income tax relief and streamline the tax code to remove special interest tax breaks that distort economic activity (by a recorded vote of 166 yeas to 259 yeas, Roll No. 276).

Pages H2884–96

H. Res. 223, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to yesterday, April 14th.

Report Filing: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file its reports to accompany H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, and H.R. 1216 at any time through Wednesday, April 27, 2011.

Page H2901

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Representative Becerra.

Page H2901

United States Holocaust Memorial Council—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Representatives Grimm, Hayworth, Meehan, Waxman, and Giffords.

Page H2902

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Representatives Thornberry, Simpson, and Boswell.

Page H2902

House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards: Representative Schock, Chairman; Representatives Price (GA), Latta, Davis (CA), Sherman, and Richmond.

Page H2902

Migratory Bird Conservation Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Representatives Wittman and Dingell.

Page H2902

Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representative Dreier, Chairman and Representative McCaul.

Page H2902

Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Representatives King (NY) and McCarthy (NY).

Page H2902

Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representative Manzullo, Chairman.

Page H2902

Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Representatives Coble and Courtney.

Page H2902

Commission on Civil Rights—Reappointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s reappointment, upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, of the following member on the part of the House to the Commission on Civil Rights for a term expiring December 15, 2016: Mr. Michael Yaki of San Francisco, CA. Additionally, the Chair announced that the term of appointment of Mr. Todd Gaziano to the Commission on Civil Rights expires on December 15, 2013.

Page H2908

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2870.

Senate Referral: S. 216 was referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

Page H2908

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2861–62, H2882–83, H2883–84, H2896, H2901. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and at 3:26 p.m., pursuant to H. Con. Res. 43, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2011.

Committee Meetings

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a Public Witness Day. Testimony was heard from various public witnesses.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT—APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Treasury [TIGTA] FY 2012 Budget. Testimony was heard from J. Russell George, Inspector General for Tax Administration.

RECENT EPA RULEMAKINGS RELATING TO BOILERS, CEMENT MANUFACTURING PLANTS, AND UTILITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on the Recent EPA Rulemakings Relating to Boilers, Cement Manufacturing Plants, and Utilities. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMUNIST CHINESE CYBER-ATTACKS, CYBER-ESPIONAGE AND THEFT OF AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Communist Chinese Cyber-Attacks, Cyber-Espionage and Theft of American Technology. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DHS CYBERSECURITY MISSION

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled “The DHS Cybersecurity Mission: Promoting Innovation and Securing Critical Infrastructure.” Testimony was heard from Sean McGurk, Director, National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

DEFENDING MARRIAGE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on Defending Marriage. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE BORDER: ARE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS IMPEDING SECURITY AND HARMING THE ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations and the Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands held a joint hearing entitled, “The Border: Are Environmental Laws and Regulations Impeding Security and Harming the Environment?” Testimony was heard from Ronald Vitiello, Deputy Chief, Customs and Border Patrol; Thomas Strickland; Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, Department of the Interior; Harris Sherman, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

IMPROPER PAYMENTS: FINDING SOLUTIONS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management held a hearing entitled, “Improper Payments: Finding Solutions.” Testimony was heard from Daniel Werfel, Controller, OMB; and Kay Daly, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, GAO.

FY 2012 BUDGET—MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM AND GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on FY 2012 Budget—Military Intelligence Program and General Defense Intelligence Program. This is a closed hearing. Testimony was heard from departmental officials.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, May 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Roy Bale Dalton, Jr., of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and the nomination of Kevin Hunter Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee. At approximately 5:30 p.m., Senate will confirm the nomination of Roy Bale Dalton, Jr., of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and vote on confirmation of the nomination of Kevin Hunter Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, May 2

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E751	Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E744, E762	Poe, Ted, Tex., E735, E740
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E742, E743	Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E746	Quigley, Mike, Ill., E750, E752
Berg, Rick, N.D., E742	Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E745, E747	Reed, Tom, N.Y., E732, E737
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E733	Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E761, E763	Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E742, E746, E756
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E737, E744, E761	Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E738, E744	Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E727, E748, E763
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E749	Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E759	Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E757
Boren, Dan, Okla., E728	Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E750, E751, E766	Sarbanes, John P., Md., E756
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E727, E728	Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E760, E762	Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E732
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E730	Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E728	Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E732
Christensen, Donna M., The Virgin Islands, E731	Kingston, Jack, Ga., E764	Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E752
Costa, Jim, Calif., E734, E760	Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E749, E751	Shuler, Heath, N.C., E763
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E757, E763	Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E751	Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E736
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E757	Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E728, E732, E734, E737, E740, E742, E744, E747, E749	Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E753
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E743, E745	Levin, Sander M., Mich., E736	Speier, Jackie, Calif., E755, E758, E760
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E750	McDermott, Jim, Wash., E764	Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E727, E728, E731, E732, E734, E735, E736, E741
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E734	McGovern, James P., Mass., E735, E740	Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E748, E751
Dreier, David, Calif., E743, E746, E748	McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E733, E735	Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E765
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E758	Markey, Edward J., Mass., E765	Walden, Greg, Ore., E760
Farr, Sam, Calif., E748	Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E761	Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E728
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E745	Miller, George, Calif., E757	Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E731, E733, E743
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E761	Miller, Jeff, Fla., E749	Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E753, E762
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E752, E754	Moran, James P., Va., E758	Wolf, Frank R., Va., E738
Granger, Kay, Tex., E744, E764	Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E753	Woodall, Rob, Ga., E763
Graves, Sam, Mo., E741	Nunes, Devin, Calif., E746	Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E729, E740
	Pence, Mike, Ind., E745	Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E755



Congressional Record

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.gpo.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.