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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1243

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 25

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

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

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

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

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

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 301. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

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

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

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

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

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE VI—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 601. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

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

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

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

SEC. 602. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 604. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

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

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

SEC. 605. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

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

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

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

SEC. 607. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 610. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE VII—POLICY STATEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 702. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

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

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

SEC. 703. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 704. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Legislation submitted by the President shall—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

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

(C) improve fairness for participants;

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

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

SEC. 705. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(6) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

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

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

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 709. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

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

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

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

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

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

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

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

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

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

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

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

(B) Outlays, $-90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $-90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $-97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $-98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $-103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $-105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $-108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

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

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) greenhouse gas emissions levels;

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

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

(8) wildland fire management activities; or

(9) the restructure of the nuclear waste program;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

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

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

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

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

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

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

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

(1) for fiscal year 2013—

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

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

(2) for fiscal year 2014—

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

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

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

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

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

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

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

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

(iv) conference reports;

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

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

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

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

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 402. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

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

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

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

(1) for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

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

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION OR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

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

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

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 411. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 415. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law

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

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1250

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $17,946,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,528,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,045,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,571,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,128,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,355,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $21,990,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,647,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,273,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $13,019,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,511,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,298,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,674,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,583,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,082,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,638,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,164,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $51,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $53,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $56,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,685,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,132,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,586,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $48,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $46,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $50,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $52,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $53,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,469,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,210,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,318,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $226,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $158,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $114,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $99,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $98,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $99,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $99,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,033,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $42,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $18,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $15,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,895,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $197,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $148,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $121,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $124,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $120,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $121,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $123,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $125,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $128,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,798,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $429,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $502,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $557,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $614,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $651,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $688,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $687,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $768,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $766,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $811,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $809,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $860,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,599,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $526,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $685,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $862,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $894,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,227,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $538,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $532,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $542,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $541,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $544,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $549,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $562,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $576,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $595,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $603,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,661,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,438,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $149,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $154,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $166,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $165,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $164,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $175,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $180,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $184,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $196,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $192,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,499,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $78,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $62,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $61,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $60,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $62,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $77,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76.916,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $26,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $30,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,721,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $342,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $369,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $417,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $499,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $594,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $664,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $725,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $725,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $773,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $773,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $820,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $820,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $861,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,941,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $2,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $2,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $2,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2.708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $3,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,927,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

SEC. 4. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimate average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) This concurrent resolution retains the social safety net that has lifted millions of Americans out of poverty and protects both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid from draconian spending cuts.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

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

(A) For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health-care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

(B) Any savings derived from changes or reforms to Medicare and Social Security should be used to extend the solvency of these vital programs and not be used to offset the cost of cutting taxes.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The underlying Republican budget dismantles the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicaid in the last year by 25 percent and includes unspecified cuts in a category called ''other mandatory spending.'' That category, of course, is Social Security and pensions for veterans and Federal employees. And then it cuts other essential Federal programs. It also repeals ObamaCare, but keeps in place the savings and tax increases that pay for it. The Republican budget also includes a $5.7 trillion tax cut that primarily benefits the wealthiest Americans and then somehow claims it will be revenue neutral by raising somebody else's taxes by $5.7 trillion, an average of about $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in America every year.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget on the other hand is based on reality and uses real numbers. Our budget makes tough choices, but not at the expense of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget calls for revenue enhancements of $2.7 trillion over the next 10 years. The budget shows that this is a real and achievable goal by highlighting approximately $4.2 trillion in revenue options that the Congress could use to achieve the $2.7 trillion in new revenues, such as limiting the deductibility of corporate interest payments, limiting the special tax breaks and corporate loopholes that are baked into our Tax Code, treating capital gains and dividends like regular income. And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this amount is less than half of the $5.7 trillion in tax increases assumed in the Republican budget.

□ 1310

The revenue enhancements called for in our budget will be used to totally cancel the sequester, to pay for a $500 billion jobs bill that will put more than 5 million Americans back to work, and to provide for an additional $300 billion in long-term investments in our economy through education, job training, health care, science, and research.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Even with these additional investments, our budget is projected to put our Nation back on a sustainable path because the deficit reduction is more than the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction commission 10-year goal.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget shows that we can create jobs, invest in education, transportation, and research, and avoid devastating health care cuts and achieve the 10-year Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction goal. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, Mr. SCOTT, for bringing forward a budget on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. I think it's important that we have all sorts of options here on the floor to be able to discuss as they relate to a budget.

I would note a couple of items that he conveniently left out. One is that the budget that the CBC brings to the floor—this will come as no surprise, Mr. Chairman—never gets to balance, which means it continues to spend more money than the government takes in, continues to spend more money than Washington takes in. The people of this great country understand that we can't continue going down this road over and over and over and over.

A couple of points that Mr. SCOTT made regarding the Republican budget, which is the budget that is the base budget here that we're bringing to the floor that, in fact, does get to balance in a responsible way:

It saves and strengthens and secures Medicare, as opposed to the misinformation that was provided by the other side;

It makes certain that States have the kind of flexibility so that they're able to provide the highest quality of health care to their Medicaid population;

It doesn't, as a matter of fact, address in a specific way the issue of Social Security because it provides for a reserve fund so that that is able to be addressed in a more specific way through the committee structure, which is also the important thing to recognize about the issue of taxes.

Our friends on the other side are so specific about what they accuse us of regarding taxes, but, in fact, as you know, Mr. Chairman, it's the Ways and Means Committee that will ultimately define that.

A couple of items that he conveniently left out on the budget that he is proposing is that they do raise taxes. In fact, they raise taxes by $2.8 trillion—$2.8 trillion over the next 10 years—and much of that increase in taxes is in the area of those who create jobs. We all know that if you tax something, you get less of it. So by taxing job creators, we'll get fewer jobs, and, Mr. Chairman, that's the last place we need to be heading right now. They spend $5.7 trillion more than the Republican budget that's being proposed, and they add another $2.9 trillion to the debt relative to the base budget that we're working on today.

I also want to address the issue of business taxes. They talk about removing the incentives that move jobs overseas. Well, Mr. Chairman, the biggest incentive to moving jobs overseas is that the United States now has the highest business tax rate in the industrialized world. If you're a business and you're planning on either expanding your business or you're thinking about starting a business here in the United States and you go to the line that says taxes, the other side of that says, no, go somewhere else, get out of here, because taxes are lower elsewhere, which means that jobs are being created elsewhere. We're driving jobs overseas by virtue of our current tax structure, and our friends on the other side of the aisle, especially with the CBC budget, actually increase that as opposed to decrease that.

I do, however, want to commend them, once again, for bringing a budget forward because, as you've heard earlier today and in the conversations around the budget, the President has not. We did find it. I found the President's budget. Here it is. Not a doggone thing on this poster, Mr. Chairman, because the President hasn't brought anything to us.

Now, that might be amusing to some, but the fact of the matter is that the law states that the President of the United States is required to present a budget to Congress by the first Monday in February. That was February 4 this year. We're a little over 6 weeks beyond that. The President has flagrantly—flagrantly—ignored his statutory responsibility to bring to the United States Congress a budget.

Now, some folks on the other side say, Oh, it happens all the time. Don't worry about that. It happens all the time. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in just one term, President Obama has missed the budget deadline more than any other President. He's now missed it four out of five times.

In the 90 years between 1923 and 2013, President Obama is the only President to miss the deadline 2 years in a row. He's the only President who's missed the deadline 3 out of 4 years in his first term, and he holds the record for the longest delay—98 days. Maybe that's the record he's trying to beat, Mr. Chairman.

So I want to commend, again, my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for bringing forward a budget. As I say, I think it's extremely important that we have all sorts of different ideas out here on the floor to be able to debate and have people take a perspective on and have the opportunity to vote ''yea'' or ''nay'' on. I would respectfully suggest, however, that their budget moves this country in the wrong direction, not the right direction, and we'll urge opposition to their budget proposal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, gentleman from Virginia, for yielding me the time.

It's really my privilege to discuss the jobs program that is at the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. The Congressional Black Caucus does acknowledge that, while me must address our debt and deficits, in the short run, an austerity budget, as the Republicans have proposed, hurts our economy rather than helps.

We have proposed a comprehensive jobs plan, paid for proudly with the largesse and the revenue that the rich have received and tax reform measures that will propel our economic recovery for everyone, not just the haves, improve our economic competitiveness, and provide opportunities for those communities that still have not reaped the benefit of recent economic resurgence.

The CBC budget includes a $100 billion investment in a national direct job creation program estimated to create 2 million jobs directly, as well as another 800,000 jobs indirectly in the private sector; $50 billion for school modernization; $50 billion for preserving teacher, law enforcement, and first responder jobs, good public service jobs that we all need; $230 billion for investing in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure; $50 billion in rebuilding America's neighborhoods; $13 billion in job training programs; and another $7 billion in summer jobs programs.

Our significant investment in jobs is the core reason why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what's the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the time.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia. It's good to have debate. It's good to have choices. It's good to have options, but that doesn't mean every option is equally good. And we're faced with that situation right here, right now, and that's why I rise in opposition to the CBC substitute budget.

There are different ways to balance a budget. Many, most Americans, many of us here, think that taking 20 percent of the value of a country's GDP, like this Federal Government does and spends it, is more than enough to run it and most anything else.

But to be fair, there are other ways to balance, and one of those ways is to raise revenue. And I want to examine just a few of the ways that this substitute budget proposes to run the Federal Government by raising revenue.

□ 1320

I see from all the different ideas here that their intention was to take from whom they believe are the richest Americans, the wealthiest Americans, those who haven't paid their fair share, the 1 percent, however you want to phrase it, but let's look at it more closely.

One, taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income at a top rate of 39.6 percent, I think this budget forgets how many middle class Americans have 401(k)s, how many of us across the Nation invest in the stock market, how many union members still on the old pension plans, those dinosaur plans, still rely on the stock market for their retirement. What are these capital gains and dividends going to do to them? They're not the richest, for sure.

Taxing financial transactions at 0.25 percent of the asset's value, the same thing, Mr. Chairman. What about all the middle class individuals, so many Americans in this country that rely for their retirement not just on Social Security but on 401(k)s, union members who rely on pensions? And what's it going to be like for them when we're taking simply more from them from their retirement?

And then perhaps the most insidious, returning estate tax levels to 2009, not only are we taxing twice, but we are making it a bad thing, apparently, to pass on our hard-earned wealth to our children, our next generation. It's no way to run a country. It's immoral, in fact.

But let's assume all these tax increases. The fact of the matter is this budget still never balances, never comes into balance. And I was struck this morning, Mr. Chairman, by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, during his 1-minute speech, when he said, when you contract with somebody to borrow money, that's what debt is. You intend to pay it back. When you contract with somebody and have no intention of paying that debt back, that's thievery.

That's exactly what we're doing, Mr. Chairman, to the children of tomorrow, to the people that do not yet exist, that do not have a vote in this matter. That's why I rise in support, and I urge all my colleagues to defeat this substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget claims to be in balance, but it's only in balance if you assume they can raise $5.7 trillion in new taxes and they cut $2.5 trillion in health care and a trillion dollars more in a category that includes Social Security and pensions.

I'd also note that a great deal has been made about the capital gains and dividend benefits in 401(k)s. I would point out to the gentleman that in a 401(k) the people do not get the benefit of that deduction. They don't pay any tax at all as it grows. When they draw it out, they draw it out as ordinary income.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for your tremendous leadership in putting together the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget; also, our chair, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her very bold vision in helping to move this forward.

As a member of the Budget Committee, as I said yesterday, I've had a chance to get into the weeds of the Republican budget. And I can say with certainty that I strongly support the Congressional Black Caucus budget because it is pro-growth, pro-people, and pro-American.

I just want to follow up on the gentlewoman from Wisconsin's comments, Congresswoman MOORE, who so eloquently stated the jobs provisions of this budget.

Let me show you the chart with regard to the 5 million jobs that this budget creates. When you look at the fact that without the Congressional Black Caucus's budget it will take us until April 2015 to create enough jobs to take us back to prerecession employment, that is not acceptable with so many people in our country who are unemployed.

This budget enhances Medicare and Medicaid.

It cancels the devastating sequester and it reins in bloated Pentagon spending.

We actually end the Overseas Contingency Fund when the President's goal is accomplished in 2014 of bringing our young men and women home from Afghanistan. This is really a slush fund. It's not even funded through the Pentagon. It's a slush fund through somewhere over at the State Department.

This budget provides $230 billion to revitalize our Nation's infrastructure and creates a $500 million jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery.

To help families stay secure in their homes until the economy fully recovers, our budget also funds a restoration of critical unemployment benefits to the full 99 weeks.

Also, we support a real effort to eradicate poverty in America with the 10–20–30 formula, which targets resources to communities that need assistance.

And we call for a national strategy to eradicate poverty by cutting it in half in 10 years.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just also conclude by saying our budget protects the safety net and protects those initiatives which create pathways out of poverty, such as the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, the SNAP program, food and nutrition assistance, and the program that assists women with nutrition assistance when they're pregnant. All of these efforts are protected in the Congressional Black Caucus budget; whereas, the Ryan budget would cut these programs. These are needed desperately as we move to a pathway to prosperity.

Our budget is pro-American, pro-growth, and pro-people.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would just point out to the gentlelady that, in fact, multiple economists have looked at the budget that Republicans have brought forward, and a couple from Stanford had an editorial, I believe, in The Wall Street Journal this week and noted that their review, their study, their evaluation of the Republican budget actually demonstrates that 500,000 jobs would be produced in the first year in the Republican budget and 1.7 million jobs in the 10th year.

So if you want jobs, there's a way to get jobs created in this country, and it is to reward those individuals who are creating jobs. That's what the Republican budget does.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another new member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. Our friends on the other side have called for what they label a balanced approach, but let's look at the record.

Is their quench for new taxes insatiable? At the start of this year, they got $600 billion in new taxes due to the fiscal cliff bill that passed. In addition, they added another $1 trillion of new taxes, starting this year, for ObamaCare. A total of $1.6 trillion in new taxes have been added since New Year's. But before the ink was even dry, they began to call for even more tax increases. In fact, the budget that we're discussing here calls for an additional $2.8 trillion of taxes that will be paid for by hardworking men and women around America. Taxes like, if you sell your house, you'll have to pay an excessive tax on the gain from the sale of your house when you're in retirement.

What do they do with their new taxes? Do they take it and pay down the debt? No. Instead, they take these additional taxes and use it to spend more.

This budget is not content with ObamaCare that passed a few years ago, no. It expands that. I do commend our friends on the other side for at least showing your intentions that you're not going to be happy until every American is on socialized medicine. And this expands ObamaCare.

It also expands food stamps. At a time when projections are showing that our economy may improve, certainly we should see individuals moving away from food stamps and on to a job supporting themselves, but that's not what we're seeing. A measure of success of a society should not be how many people can we put on public assistance. The measure of success of a society should be how many men and women can we allow to help themselves.

But this budget does cut spending in one area. It cuts into our national defense, even more so than the President's budget that he submitted last year. So while we're increasing spending on things that would drain our economy and deprive our children of obtaining jobs, we're compromising the very defense of our Nation. And when does it balance? Never.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and urge you to vote ''no.''

□ 1330

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just before I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands.

First of all, the gentleman just complained about the ObamaCare taxes. What he didn't say is that the Republican budget keeps all the taxes; they just repeal the benefits.

The Republican budget also does not cancel the sequester. The sequester is estimated to cost 700,000 to 2 million jobs. They do not cancel the sequester. In fact, they have additional cuts that will even add to those job losses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for yielding, and for the excellent job that you and your team did on the budget.

The CBC budget is proudly a statement of CBC, but also of American, values. As a physician, I'm particularly proud of its investment in health. It protects and strengthens Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and children's health insurance; fully funds the Affordable Care Act, adds a public health option, and includes provisions that will reduce health disparities.

It fully funds the AIDS Drug Assistance Program, mental health and substance abuse, maternal and child health, community health centers, the Offices of Minority Health, and the National Institute for Minority and Health Disparity Research at NIH.

It preserves Healthy Start, funds programs to increase the number and diversity of the health workforce, and gives communities the tools to improve health and well-being through restoring programs like REACH, dental health projects, the National Minority AIDS Education and Training Center, and other related programs. And it ensures that minority physicians and those practicing in poor neighborhoods and their patients will have the benefit of health information technology.

The CBC budget in its entirety addresses the socioeconomic determinants of health, beginning with the 10/20/30 program to reduce poverty. All of these provisions will reduce health care spending in the medium and long term. It is a masterpiece of a budget, and I urge everyone to vote for it. And yes, we will not be happy until every American has access to quality health care.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side, please?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. May I inquire of my friend how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I think we have two more speakers, including myself.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am so very, very proud to be here in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This is a budget with a centerpiece: Job creation. This is a budget that is balanced. This is a budget that is in opposition to the Ryan budget that would slash and burn and cut and deny our senior citizens, deny our children, do away with Head Start and many programs that the American people deserve to have.

I am a member of the Financial Services Committee, now serving as a ranking member. I created the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a program that goes into communities that have been devastated by foreclosures based on the subprime meltdown that we had in this country, where so many people were tricked into signing onto loans and mortgages they could not afford. Thus, they went into foreclosure. These communities have been devastated with boarded-up homes, with stray animals on the property, with police and fire having to spend more money in these cities to try and upkeep them. The Ryan budget would do away with the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

The home values must be maintained in these communities. Some people are trying to keep up their homes, but with these boarded-up properties, the value of the homes go down. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a project that would revitalize the properties and put them back on the market as affordable homes. Instead of doing away with this program that helps to keep the value of our American citizens' homes, we protect it. The Ryan budget would do away with it.

Thank the CBC for understanding how to protect our neighborhoods, how to protect our consumers and our citizens, and how to make our neighborhoods safe, despite the fact that we almost went into a depression based on the financial services meltdown.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have one more speaker outside of myself, and then I will be pleased to close.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. We are prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the CBC for actually coming to the floor with a budget, something that the President of the United States has not been able to do four out of five times, even though it is the law of the land that he is required to do so. So I commend them for doing so.

We should look to see what is it that we agree with in this and what do we disagree with. We do agree on several points, such as that we want to have a just and fair Tax Code. We do agree, as we have in our budget, to make sure that we address the most vulnerable, those people who are out of work, the poor in the country, those who are trying hard to make ends meet, to try to end poverty as well, to try to make sure that there is health care in this country. But where we differ from the CBC is the impact that their budget would have on each and every one of these.

Their budget would have a devastating impact on those who are out of work, those who are trying to not just get a handout, but get a hand up; those who are looking for health care and not being able to afford it; those who are looking for health care from the Federal Government and realizing that within a short period of time, over the next decade, we will see, actually, the money in the Federal Government for the health care that they're receiving right now basically run out.

So that is why I applaud their attempt to come to the floor with a budget. But I ask them to take a look at what the impact of their budget will do as opposed to what the Republican budget will do. We will actually be able to create jobs in this country. We did so before in something called the JOBS Act, which we passed in a bipartisan manner.

We are going to take the next step to make sure that there is a level playing field in this country versus other countries, to bring back those jobs that have been lost to other foreign nations and bring them back into this country as well. We will be able to reform the system with regard to the poor. We will be able to provide for a system that provides for the American family in a fair and just Tax Code.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget reacts to this chart which shows the recovery over past recessions.

This recession has been deeper and longer than any others. We still haven't gotten the jobs back. At the rate we're going, we're not going to get the jobs we lost in the 2008 recession for another 2 years. That's why it's important that the Congressional Black Caucus has a budget that has $500 billion in jobs. That will create about 5 million jobs as soon as we can get the money out the door, 5 million jobs, which will significantly reduce the impact of that recession. That's in stark contrast to the Republican budget, which maintains the sequester. The suggestion there is that 700,000 to 2 million jobs would be lost.

So we have a choice: 5 million jobs or lose jobs. We have a choice in terms of investments in education, transportation, scientific research, investments in our future, or cuts in those investments.

We have a credible path to achieve the Simpson-Bowles 10-year goal rather than a budget that depends on $5.7 trillion in unspecified tax increases to offset their $5.7 trillion tax cut that they say is revenue neutral. Also, it is a budget that requires massive cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and other health care programs, pensions, and everything else that will adversely affect those most in need.

The one-third cut, 25 to 30 percent cut in Medicaid, we have to remember that two-thirds of the Medicaid expense goes to the elderly and disabled. What is their plans for them if you're cutting Medicaid by 25 to 30 percent?

We can do better. We can have a progressive, pro-people, pro-growth, pro-jobs agenda; or we can have the devastating cuts in the Republican budget, which has $5.7 trillion unspecified tax cuts in it if you believe they will come up with that kind of money.

□ 1340

I think we should make the right choice. That right choice is the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would, once again, remind my friends on the other side of the aisle and those listening that the Republican budget creates 500,000 jobs by the end of the first year, and it will result in over 1 million jobs in the 10th year. It's important to appreciate that. And I agree with my friend on the chart that he has about the jobs decreasing, the deepest and longest period of poor job growth in any recession. He's absolutely right. He's correct on that.

But what this budget does that he proposes is doubles down on policies that don't work. Spending money that we don't have is not a prescription for more job creation. A little honesty, Mr. Chairman, on this: only in Washington, as the American people know, is spending at a lower rate a cut. More spending at a lower rate in this town is a reduction, is a cut accused by the other side.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican budget increases spending on average 3.4 percent each year over the next 10 years. It's a responsible budget. It's a budget that actually gets to balance, which means that we don't spend money at the end of this budget that Washington doesn't have, and gets us on a path to paying off the debt.

It's that way that we realize that we can create jobs for the American people, we can ensure that young people in this country will be able to get out of college and be able to find a job in their sphere of education, and we can make certain that seniors have the kind of services that they need, the kind of things that have been destroyed by the current administration and by the budget being proposed on the other side. The Republican budget is a responsible budget.

I urge that Members of our party vote down the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chair, every year since 1981, the Congressional Black Caucus has offered a fair and balanced alternative budget.

The CBC Alternative Budget for fiscal year 2014 is a "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" budget. It acknowledges that only by investing in people can you build a bridge to a better America.

America doesn't need an austerity budget. Americans need and deserve more.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the CBC "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" Budget Alternative.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to ask my colleagues to reject the budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Republican led Congress and support the FY 2014 Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget, the Congressional Progressive Caucus Alternative Budget, and Democratic Substitute Budget. These budgets will protect our families, put Americans back to work, restore fairness to our tax code, and make critical investments in education, transportation, innovation, research, and job creation.

The proposals submitted by the Republicans would undermine vital programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP. The Ryan budget cuts programs that assist low-income families, communities of color, young children, students, older people, individuals with disabilities, the unemployed, and the uninsured.

Specifically, the CBC Alternative Budget proposes a balanced plan that focuses on economic growth, invests in communities, and creates economic opportunity for all.

The CBC budget:

Cancels the sequester; creates a $500 billion jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery; provides $230 billion in investments for America's crumbling infrastructure; reduces the deficit by $2.8 trillion over the next 10 years; addresses the Medicare Doc Fix;. protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and TANF; proposes the 10–20–30 plan which targets resources to the communities that need assistance the most; addresses health disparities through full funding for the Affordable Care Act and strong support for the National Institutes of Health.

Again, I ask my colleagues to vote against the Ryan Budget that does not balance the budget, and will harm our children, seniors, and the middle class, and to vote for resolutions that strike a sensible balance between revenue increases and spending cuts.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–21.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,007,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,539,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,090,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,312,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,467,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,594,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,731,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,890,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,090,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,311,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,521,978,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: −$30,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $268,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $483,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $533,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $563,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $565,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $581,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $606,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $633,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $660,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $689,833,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,490,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,802,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,699,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,661,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,745,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,912,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,085,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,236,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,394,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,628,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,786,461,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,446,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,737,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,694,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,664,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,736,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,873,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,044,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,180,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,349,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,590,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,735,162,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the

amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: −$1,438,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$1,198,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$604,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$351,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$268,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$279,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$313,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$290,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$259,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$278,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$213,184,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,613,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $19,003,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,279,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,296,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,853,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,392,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,427,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,907,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,796,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $14,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $14,748,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $15,161,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,497,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,842,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,995,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,418,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,799,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $653,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $627,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $533,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $532,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $530,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $552,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $564,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $578,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $566,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $602,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,707,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $65,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $74,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $65,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $63,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $64,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $66,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $67,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,420,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $32,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $44,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,747,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,305,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $52,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $53,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $54,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $55,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $58,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $59,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $61,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,084,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $18,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,531,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$26,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$22,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $25,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,422,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $263,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $264,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $266,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $242,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $218,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $194,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $145,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $126,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $128,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $130,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,190,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $55,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $34,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $37,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,057,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $395,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $432,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $254,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $144,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $136,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $142,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $137,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $139,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $142,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $145,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $148,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,217,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $372,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $433,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $517,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $623,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $659,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $696,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $695,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $743,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $731,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $776,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $820,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $817,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $870,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,771,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $507,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $525,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $547,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $546,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $593,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $608,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $631,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $631,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $691,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $738,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $738,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $787,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $893,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $893,155,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $633,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $703,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $730,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $717,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $642,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $606,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $609,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $630,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $648,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $672,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $685,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,911,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,038,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $148,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $159,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $169,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $179,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $175,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $174,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $185,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $190,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $194,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $207,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $204,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,814,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $56,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $73,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $67,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $69,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $71,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $73,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $75,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $82,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $85,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,045,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,579,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $332,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $379,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $433,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $433,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $526,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $629,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $701,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $701,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $763,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $810,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $852,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $852,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $890,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $890,245,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,809,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

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

(A) State budgets have suffered significantly during the economic downturn. According to the National Governor's Association, half of all states are projecting lower total revenues in 2013 than they saw in 2008. To assist struggling states, the Back to Work Budget temporarily increases funding for Medicaid – the single largest portion of total state spending – through the Federal Medical Assistance Percentages program. This will help stabilize Medicaid, which is a vital program for low-income and middle-class families, providing health and long-term care services to those stricken with catastrophic illness, injury, or disability, or facing prolonged infirmity.

(B) The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expanded a number of tax credits targeted at working families to boost relief during hard economic times. The Back to Work Budget retains the improvements made to the Earned Income Tax Credit (qualifying children and phase-out range), Child and Dependent Care Credit, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit. These credits fuel demand for American businesses by putting money in the hands of families that truly need it.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

(2) For non means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 percent under current law.

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

(A) Medicare is a cornerstone of the American health care system for more than 45 million America seniors. It is an exemplary program that provides the most efficient care to a segment of the population that costs more to treat. The Back to Work Budget protects beneficiaries and makes the system even more efficient. It amends Part D of Medicare to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, which will save Medicare $157 billion over 10 years and will reduce costs for seniors. The budget adopts policies to prohibit ''pay for delay'' agreements that reduce competition and modifies periods of exclusivity to increase availability of needed therapies. The budget also accelerates the use of bundling payments as an alternative to fee-for-service payments. It builds on Affordable Care Act efficiencies in administration of information and payments. Using standardized electronic systems for administration information such as claims, billing, payments and eligibility creates a more efficient and less fragmented health care system.

(B) The bulk of agriculture commodity subsidies go to large corporate farms that grow commodity crops such as corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and soybeans. These crops are often grown using unsustainable methods that require high levels of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides, leading to polluted waterways and degraded soil. The Back to Work Budget eliminates certain commodity subsidies, which will save billions, while reducing environmental impacts.

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in presenting our Back to Work budget, a budget of the Progressive Caucus of this House, we are first pleased to announce that in less than 48 hours, 105,000 citizen cosponsors have joined with us in presenting this budget. They are pleased to affirm, and the point of this is House Budget Committee chairman, Representative PAUL RYAN, has released a budget proposal that is the most reckless austerity plan he's ever proposed. Instead, we get a budget that will slow the economy and kill jobs.

We urge you to vote for the Progressive Caucus' Back to Work budget which will grow the economy, create 7 million jobs, and ask the wealthy and multinationals to pay their fair share so we can make investments in our people and our future—105,000 citizen cosponsors in less than 48 hours.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the Progressive Caucus, my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just congratulate everybody with the Progressive Caucus and thank all of the staff that did such a good job preparing this excellent budget which gives us an amazing choice as Americans to confront this jobs crisis. I'm so proud that our Speaker has told the world—Speaker BOEHNER—that the debt crisis is not immediate. He's right, it's not. But let me tell you what is immediate: the jobs crisis.

That's why the Back to Work budget brings down unemployment to 5.3 within 3 years by investing in people—our construction workers, our teachers, and our police officers. We're also fiscally responsible, reducing the deficit over the long run by $4.4 trillion.

The Republican budget makes the wrong choices for our country. I respect the fact that they have honestly projected a vision, but it's an austere vision for the American people. It's no surprise that this message lost the election that we just had. It was put in front of the people. They said we will have none of it, but the American people do want what's in the Back to Work budget.

Gallup released a poll that confirms what you and I already know, and that is that the American people want jobs, not austerity; 72 percent, Mr. Chairman, of Americans said that they support putting people back to work repairing our Nation's infrastructure, including a majority of Republicans.

Now, the fact is that the Back to Work budget is about putting people back to work. As the Speaker and I agree, it's not the moment where we need to clamp down on debt. It's the moment we need to put Americans back to work. So which budget meets the test? The Progressive Caucus budget invests at the level the American Society of Civil Engineers says is needed to close our infrastructure gap. The Republican budget cuts transportation by 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to get back to work, and let's pass the Back to Work budget.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, as they say, in opposition to the Progressive Caucus substitute. While my friends across the aisle are motivated by good intentions, I believe that their substitute is, frankly, a blueprint for fiscal disaster. Instead of restoring the certainty to the economy by promoting fairness and providing American families the opportunity for more prosperity, this budget is simply a black hole for American families.

I can at least give credit to both the Progressive Caucus and the Democrat Caucus for offering a budget because the President of the United States has failed to do so. As you are aware, on February 4, the President, as required by law, is to give us a budget. It's March 20 now; and the American people, well, we're still waiting. That is the fourth time in 5 years that President Obama has failed to submit a budget on time and failed to abide by the law.

The Senate Democrats, well, they're not much better. It has taken them almost 4 years to produce a budget that basically now increases government spending by $265 billion, taxes up by almost $1 trillion, and cuts health care providers by almost $300 billion. Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are nearly $4 trillion larger than those under the House plan.

So, today, we have a Progressive substitute on the floor. This budget will do what? It will raise taxes by almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years, including a new tax on carbon. $5.7 trillion in new taxes necessarily means greater tax burdens on who? The American family. These tax cuts put job creators in the penalty box again, and that means more Americans will be where? Without jobs.

These tax policies are deceptively sold under, really, a warped notion of what ''fairness'' is. The reality is this ''fairness'' of theirs is merely a heavy-handed government taking from one pocket and putting in another pocket.

This budget's tax policy is based on the equality of outcome rather than equality of opportunity. When he's talking about equality, Milton Friedman once pointed out that a society that puts equality before freedom will get neither. A society that puts freedom before equality, however, will get a high degree of both.

So true fairness is the freedom to manage and direct one's own life and one's own future. Those who take risks giving their all in the pursuit of the American Dream deserve to keep what they've earned. Those who work hard day in and day out, they deserve to keep what they've earned.

But the Progressive budget is nothing but regressive. There's nothing fair about this budget, especially to the risk-taker or to the hardworking American family. Their budget would spend nearly $9 trillion more than the Republican budget. Note, now, when I say those numbers—where does that money come from—that means from our children and our grandchildren. They ultimately will be the ones who will have to bear this burden.

This budget would also establish a government-run health insurance option under ObamaCare and let the government basically set price controls on drugs. What does that mean? That means for those who were around back in 1970s, I think that's most of us, price controls on gasoline. How did that work out for us? Not too long. Waiting lines for gas is one thing. Waiting lines, however, for lifesaving medicine is a whole other story.

This budget would also expand the current, broken, and failed Federal job-training program without any reform whatsoever. This budget calls for even more money for the bureaucrats in Washington with regard to education, and this budget calls for even more money into the broken-down highway transit system that we have in this country.

□ 1350

And this budget even fails in the government's first responsibility—providing for the common defense. This budget further goes and guts the Defense Department by calling for almost $700 billion in cuts to the Pentagon compared to our budget.

This Progressive substitute then would put this country basically on the wrong path. For that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote on this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, there is some adage about if you do the same thing over and over again without changing it, that that is a mark of insanity. That adage applies to the Ryan budget 2, the same as Ryan budget 1, and to 10 years of failed fiscal policy that our budget, by putting people to work, attempts to get us out of that fiscal black hole.

With that, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON for their bold and visionary leadership of the Progressive Caucus.

As a member of the Budget Committee opposed to the job-killing ''Pathway to Poverty'' Ryan budget, I stand in strong support of the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget. The number one priority of the Progressive Caucus budget is fixing the job crisis. That is exactly what we want to do in our Back to Work budget. That is what it does.

Most economists argue that job creation equals deficit reduction. The CPC budget asks the wealthiest 1 percent, Big Oil, and huge corporations to pay just a little more so we can invest in the American people and create 7 million American jobs.

Our budget saves over $1.8 trillion in bloated Pentagon spending by eliminating the Overseas Contingency Operations account, which really is a slush fund that has funded two wars off budget. We refocus our resources into a modern military able to face 21st century threats.

We also require the Pentagon, the single largest Federal agency, with the highest waste, fraud, and abuse, to pass an audit test and pass it now. It is the only Federal agency not subject to an audit.

Our budget replaces the disastrous sequester by supporting critical spending in education, infrastructure, and we reject benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give support to what is happening for the Path to Prosperity. It is a responsible budget.

And I also rise to encourage my colleagues. It is a good thing for us to come down and get a chance to talk about budgets and where we are headed. It is a good thing to propose multiple options to be able to have this kind of dialogue about where we are headed as a Nation. This is what is happening in the Senate this week as well. For the first time in 4 years, the Senate has an ongoing dialogue about budgets and about the future.

While almost $6 trillion of debt has been added to our children, we have not done a budget between the House and the Senate in almost 4 years now. It is time to be able to do that. I encourage my Senate colleagues as well, and congratulate them for also taking this up.

I do look forward to one day seeing the President's budget. I did see today in the news that the President has released his final four bracket for the NCAA men's basketball bracket, but we have yet to actually see his budget. At some point, we hope to be able to see our national priority be on budgets, not on NCAA brackets, in the days ahead.

The budget that we are proposing focuses on families that need certainty. The way that you budget and you plan for the future and the way to set aside finances for the future is some kind of certainty in what is happening. We don't have that right now as a Nation.

For most families that actually live month to month, they don't have a large amount of resources to set aside for future investment. If a ticking debt bomb is coming for them, they expect the people in Washington to actually pay attention to that so that the little bit of money they can set aside for retirement doesn't blow up in some giant debt crisis in the days ahead.

This is a moment to deal with our debt. The budget that we are proposing is a responsible budget that takes 10 years to slowly start to bring us back into balance. Only in Washington is a drastic draconian cut actually reducing the increase.

What the Ryan budget does, what we are proposing, is a 1.6 percent decrease on the increase. Right now, the Federal budget is scheduled to increase by 5 percent over the next 10 years. We will actually just increase the budget 3.4 percent. I would say that is fairly modest. That is a way to be able to deal with what is happening in the Nation, and it is also a way to deal with what is happening to come in the days ahead.

We are not promoting additional stimulus spending as the budget that is being proposed now is. A giant proposal for additional spending did not help us several years ago. What was promised right now is that we would be at 5½ percent unemployment rather than still hovering near 8 percent unemployment, as we have for so long now.

Jobs do not come from additional Federal spending long term. If you want real jobs, it has to be in the private sector. That is the only thing that can be sustained; otherwise, you are dependent year after year after year with additional taxes and additional spending. We need to have the private sector be engaged in this. The way to do that is to encourage the private sector with some level of stability.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the Back to Work budget. The Back to Work budget puts jobs first, which is actually the best way to reduce our deficit. Jobs equal deficit reduction.

Our budget will create nearly 7 million jobs and bring unemployment down to 5 percent in 3 years. It protects Social Security and strengthens the critical benefits of Medicare and Medicaid. Our budget responds to what the American people say they want: job creation, more revenues from those who can afford to pay, and smart spending cuts that target waste, not opportunity.

A new Gallup poll released today found that more than three-quarters of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, support Federal Government efforts that focus on creating jobs. Americans don't want austerity or tax cuts, more tax cuts for the rich. They want jobs, good jobs.

So you can vote for good jobs by voting for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman who played a critical role in fashioning the budget that is before us, the Republican budget, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, like speakers before me, I am thankful and appreciative that others are proposing substitute budgets. It is good to have options, Mr. Chair. It is good to have a debate. But not all options are equally good, so I rise against the substitute budget that is now before us.

Admittedly, there are a couple of different ways and a combination thereof that you can balance a budget: spending cuts—and, by the way, when a Federal Government already takes, on average, 20 percent of the value of all the goods and services that a country produces, a lot of us think that is more than enough to run the government and that spending reductions are actually the solution.

Revenue increases might also get you to balance. That is certainly what this Progressive substitute tries to do. Nearly $6 trillion in tax increases over the next 10 years. And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, they don't get to balance. It doesn't happen. $6 trillion more of the people's property this budget confiscates, and they still can't balance the budget.

Why is balancing the budget so darn important? Well, a couple different reasons. You cannot start paying off the debt until you get to a balanced budget so that you have a surplus to start paying that debt down.

So their intention, Mr. Chair, is not to pay down the debt. That is what they are stating in this budget, and, frankly, that's immoral.

If you intend to pay a debt back in any contractual situation, or even in this country's budget situation, it is called a debt. When you take money from future generations, when you take money from people that don't yet exist with no intention to pay it back, as this budget does, have no intention to pay it back, it is called thievery, and that's wrong. That is why this budget needs to fail.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, when, in the course of the last decade-plus, multinational corporations, billionaires in this country have been curried favor with tax breaks, loopholes that have allowed them to pay less than the average American, that has hurt the economy. And I would suggest that, aside from thievery, that is gaming the system and not sharing in the full responsibility we all have as Americans to take care of this country.

I would now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN.

□ 1400

Mr. POCAN. The number one issue before our country is not the deficit; it's getting the economy going and creating jobs. We have 12 million people who are still unemployed and millions more who are underemployed in this country. That's why the best budget we could put forward is one that creates jobs, not one that costs us 2 million jobs as is estimated by the austerity policies of the Republican Party. It's not just the Congressional Progressive Caucus that says this. Our Congressional Budget Office says that three-quarters of the deficit we're going to see in 2014 is caused by underemployment and unemployment.

The real enemy to deficit reduction is not a new made-up spending crisis; it's the need for jobs.

The Back to Work budget makes a real commitment to job creation, creating 7 million jobs and reducing unemployment to 5 percent within 3 years. It invests in education, in police, firefighters, teachers, infrastructure; and it ends the job-killing cuts of the sequester. Instead of balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class and the neediest, the Back to Work budget has the back of America's middle class, and it does it while responsibly reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. In recognizing that we can create the jobs and the prosperity by not raising taxes at the same time, I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. It's time for our Nation to get our priorities right; and according to the Constitution, there are only a few things that we should be doing here in Congress. One of them is to provide for the common defense; but, sadly, this substitute bill guts our national defense and leaves us very vulnerable as a Nation. Let's review where we've been.

A couple of years ago, Defense made some efficiencies under Secretary Gates and cut $78 billion. Then with the Budget Control Act, immediately, $487 billion more was cut from the national defense. Then sequestration has kicked in, which is another $500 billion from national defense, and this proposed budget here goes even beyond that.

Our Republican budget replaces cuts from the sequester back into the national defense and keeps it a priority. It makes sure our men and women in uniform have what they need, but this budget cuts an additional $658 billion from the Pentagon. Even Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta earlier said that, with sequestration, it would hollow out our forces. So, certainly, this would do even more.

With sequestration, if we don't replace it, which this budget does not, we're going to see 100,000 fewer soldiers and marines; the Navy will likely have to mothball 60 ships, including two carrier battle groups while a quarter of our bombers would be jeopardized; we would also see the elimination of 250 fighter aircraft and higher fees for military health care. Now, that's not providing for the common defense. In addition, if sequestration is not overturned, for which our budget allows, then we could see up to 2.1 million jobs cut.

They're calling this budget a Back to Work budget, but when our men and women in uniform come back from Afghanistan, instead of being met with ticker tape parades, they're going to be met with pink slips. It's wrong, and we can do better.

There are serious ramifications. Our budget replaces those cuts, and it's needed. There are threats in the world, and this is no time for us to be cutting our defense. We have Iran threatening not only our neighbors, but us; and it is getting closer to having a nuclear capability. We have even this week North Korea shooting off a missile and putting out YouTube videos of that missile coming here and hitting not only cities of the United States, but even the U.S. Capitol. In addition to that, there are radical Islamists around the world who still want to harm us.

Now is not the time to cut our national defense. We need to keep our priorities right. We need to provide for the common defense. We need to pass the Republican House budget and reject this substitute that will hollow out our forces and endanger our families.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The Back to Work budget sets a level of 2006 for defense. Pentagon spending has doubled over the last decade; 2006 was the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the war on terrorism. We just celebrated the 10th anniversary of Iraq. There has been $2.2 trillion spent on that war—a war, I might say, that was not paid for at all. This does not cripple defense; this merely brings it to a realistic level so as to share in the reconstruction of this economy of ours.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I want to thank Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA for their leadership with the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

I rise in support of the Back to Work budget. Let me just say it again—back to work. This is what this budget is all about, ladies and gentlemen—investment in our infrastructure. We have bridges that are falling apart, streets that need repair, water systems that need upgrading. We can create jobs. The Republicans and the Ryan budget talk about jobs. They talk the talk, but they don't walk the walk.

I tried to get an amendment on the TIGER program, which would increase the funding for jobs in transportation that we need so badly. They rejected that. They rejected that because they're focused on making sure that they give tax cuts to the richest people in this country, making sure that they keep those tax loopholes for the privileged—not investing in America's future and in America's growth.

The people are expecting us to make them their priority, to make sure that we are investing in opportunities for them, their families, their children, and their neighborhoods. No, the Ryan budget pays no attention to any of that. These privileged people on the other side of the aisle, who don't have to worry about jobs and who don't have to worry about any of that, deny the people the right to just participate.

Mr. GARRETT. I would ask the Chair how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. That being the case, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Back to Work budget is the first budget that recognizes the truth about our so-called ''deficit crisis'': we don't have one. Speaker BOEHNER and Chairman RYAN went on television on Sunday and said that there is no immediate crisis, that it is the unemployment numbers we should be worried about.

Now is not the time for austerity. It is the time for the government to invest where the private sector won't. They're sitting on their money, waiting. This is the time to bolster our new and growing industries, like biomedical research and technology. Now is the time to rebuild our infrastructure. Creating jobs, as this budget does, is the only way we will become self-sustaining. With lower unemployment, fewer people need public assistance, and more people pay taxes. That's how you shrink the deficit. That's fiscal responsibility.

My Republican colleagues love to talk about balancing household budgets. Well, I don't know any American family that would use its children's lunch money to pay down its credit cards, and that's what they're proposing in the Ryan budget. Most families choose to invest in college educations, health care and retirements, trading current debt for future returns.

It's time to choose what kind of country we're going to live in. Do we grow with education, investments and a strong social safety net; or do we cut our way to higher unemployment, instability, and class divide?

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which will increase unemployment and savage Medicare and Medicaid and other programs that families depend on, mostly to finance tax cuts for the rich and partly to fix the deficit crisis that we have already tamed. In 2009, the deficit was 10.1 percent of GDP. Next year, it will be down to 5.3 percent. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget would make sweeping, regressive changes to the Tax Code, which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut averaging $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. With 12 million people searching for employment and with almost 5 million Americans without jobs for more than 6 months, we do have a jobs crisis. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of the Republican budget would be to decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percent, resulting in 2 million additional jobs lost in 2014 alone.

If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

□ 1410

In contrast, the Back to Work budget addresses the jobs crisis head on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year, by making stark investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transits. It protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and family support systems.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result has been a double-dip recession and 12 percent unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which is merely a repackaging of the same extreme agenda that the American people rejected last fall.

Simply put, this bill is a disaster.

The House Republicans' budget would again try to end Medicare as we know it by replacing the guarantee of health coverage with a private voucher program that would reduce benefits. This throws seniors back onto the mercy of the private insurance market, while every year giving them less and less of the health benefits they have earned through a lifetime of hard work.

The Republican budget would not only make permanent the arbitrary, across-the-board budget cuts known as 'sequestration,' it would go further—making even more savage cuts to domestic programs. Critical social services like food stamps, college assistance for low-income families, Section 8 housing, home heating assistance, and Medicaid—all would face drastic cuts. Under the Republican proposal, our transportation investments would be cut by 20% over the next 10 years, exacerbating the challenges posed by our outdated roads, bridges, and airports. The bill also completely eliminates support for PBS, NPR, AmeriCorps, and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The Republican budget makes all of these cuts while refusing to cut a dime of military spending. What's worse, the Republican plan actually reverses planned reductions to military spending by increasing cuts to vital social programs—a callously unfair proposal that will have terrible consequences for millions of American families.

To add insult to injury, the bill before us today would make sweeping, regressive changes to the tax code which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut that averages $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less, which is just one more reason why we must defeat this bill.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. What we have is a jobs crisis, with 12 million people searching for employment, and almost 5 million Americans without a job for more than 6 months.

In contrast with the Republican spending plan, the Back to Work Budget addresses the jobs crisis head-on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year by making historic investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transit. It would enable States and local governments to hire laid-off teachers, cops, and firefighters, putting them back to work in strengthening our communities.

The Back to Work Budget would preserve our commitment to seniors by making no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, while reducing health care costs by negotiating drug prices, increasing competition in the health care marketplace, and reducing fraud.

Our budget would also adopt a commonsense tax system that asks the wealthiest to pay their fair share while lowering the tax burden on middle class families. We would also extend the Making Work Pay tax credit to help low-wage workers get back to work and providing for their families.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of all of these policies would decrease GDP by 1.7%, resulting in 2 million jobs lost in 2014 alone. If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

The American people rejected this extremist ideology last fall, and I hope that my colleagues follow their lead and reject this bill today.

But the larger problem with the Republican budget is that it will increase unemployment and savage Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs that families depend upon, in order to fix a deficit "crisis" which we have already tamed. In 2009 the deficit was 10.1% of GDP. By next year, it will be down to 5.3%. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

Basic economics tells us that government should pay off debt during good times while protecting jobs and middle class security during bad times. By balancing revenues with investments and creating millions of new jobs, the Back to Work Budget would produce significant economic growth while reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion over 10 years.

But callous, unbalanced cuts to domestic programs, particularly of the magnitude that House Republicans are proposing, would spell disaster for our economic recovery.

While GOP leaders claim to be making tough choices when it comes to our spending priorities, again and again they seem to only be making the wrong choices. They choose tax breaks for millionaires and the largest corporations over tax fairness for the middle class. They choose to reduce access to health care by voucherizing Medicare instead of protecting the benefits that seniors have earned through a lifetime of hard work. They choose to avoid required reductions in military spending by instead cutting programs that feed hungry children, heat family homes, and make college affordable.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result is a double-dip recession and 12% unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

Mr. GARRETT. And just to take a word from the gentlelady from California, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who has actually walked the walk and created jobs to create more American prosperity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to the American people to produce a smart, responsible budget; a budget that balances, that encourages job growth, and supports job creators; a budget that simplifies our overly complicated Tax Code and lowers tax rates for corporations and the middle class.

This budget just doesn't add up. In fact, it further complicates the Tax Code and will greatly hamper job creation. It would create five new tax brackets for upper-income individuals and small businesses, and would raise taxes on hardworking middle class Americans. It's not good policy to raise taxes ever, and especially not in a struggling economy.

I know what it takes to run a successful business. I have owned and operated my small business for 41 years, and it was said I walked the walk, I talked the talk.

This budget won't work in the real world, and it won't work in any world. This budget contains trillions in new taxes, trillions in new spending, and adds trillions more to the deficit. Pretty soon this budget would need its own bailout.

The American people deserve better. They beg for the Ryan budget. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this substitute.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my Republican friends on convincing some Americans that the only thing they should be thinking about is debt and deficit. While it is important, we acknowledge that, even Speaker BOEHNER last weekend said that it was not an immediate crisis. But the immediate crisis is the jobs crisis, so we should be comparing these budgets based on who creates more jobs.

Now, the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget creates 7 million jobs in its first year with a jobs package that repairs 35,000 public schools, rehires 300,000 laid-off teachers, and boosts consumer demand with a tax credit for working families. I believe my friend who just spoke said that we raise taxes on middle class families. Not true. We actually cut taxes on middle class families.

The Republican budget would kill 2 million jobs in its first year by slashing investment in research, education, and public safety.

Now by a job-to-job comparison, not just a debt-to-debt, deficit-to-deficit comparison—again, an important thing, but not the most important thing—on the jobs measure, the Back to Work budget is superior in every way to the Republican budget. It puts people back to work doing jobs that need doing.

The American Society of Civil Engineers, experts who are completely nonpartisan, have said we have $3.3 trillion in unmet maintenance needs. We make a downpayment on that infrastructure gap, and we put Americans back to work with the Back to Work budget.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has the right to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Back to Work budget is a budget that is common sense, and it reflects the values of the American people. It is a budget that deals with the realities of our economic times and our social times in this country.

This budget is about investment. It's about saying that the greatest resource we have in this country is the American people. We need to put them to work. We need to educate them for the future, and we need to provide them with some economic security for the middle class, working people, so they, too, can enjoy the economic benefits of this great Nation of ours.

We also do not step on those who are the most vulnerable. We provide them with the security, with Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, so that they, too, can continue to utilize the full benefits of those earned benefits that they have.

This fiscal debate today with the Ryan budget, too, and the other good budgets that have been proposed today is really an argument and a debate about the values and the future of this Nation. The Back to Work budget accepts the reality that we're in. It does not try to repeat a failed policy of the past, and takes us in a direction that in 10 years—and in 10 years, this country will be more solvent, more secure, and unemployment will be down and the investment in this time will pay off tremendous dividends for the future. Our budget is about the future. It is not about being mired in the past, as the Ryan budget is.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, so here we are at the end of the debate, and where are we?

The Progressive substitute, what would it do? It would raise taxes on the American family. It would increase spending throughout the country. It would put programs such as Medicare, to allow them to go bankrupt, if you will, within the decade, in 2023. It would do all this and put the burden on our children and never, ever balance.

In contrast, before us is the House Republican's Path to Prosperity. What does it do? It takes the first step. It takes the very first step toward reversing this trend, this path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats on that side of the aisle, and the Senate Democrats as well, have laid out for the American people. See, the Republican budget stops spending money that we do not have. The Republican budget simply does the right things in this area.

The Republican budget fixes our broken Tax Code. It does away with all of those unfair corporate deductions and the like that we've talked about. There is some commonality there. So it fixes our broken Tax Code, and it does so in a way at the end of the day creates jobs, increases wages, and helps the American family. The Republican budget will protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, not allowed by the other side of the aisle. The Republican budget will also reform our welfare programs, such as Medicaid, so they can actually deliver on their promise and not go bankrupt.

Every American family, every family in this country understands the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and the Democrats could surely learn by talking to them across the country. Budgets are more than numbers. Budgets basically come here to Congress and set priorities, if you will; and beyond that, they have real impact on human beings.

Unlike the Progressive substitute that's before us right now, the Path to Prosperity will provide real economic security for workers, for parents. It will ensure security retirement for the elderly and our seniors. It will expand opportunity for the young. For that reason, I urge this Chamber to vote on the side of freedom and opportunity and reject the Progressive Caucus budget substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Grijalva substitute amendment.

The amendment before us right now does nothing to get our nation back on a sustainable spending path. Instead, it proposes devastating cuts to the Department of Defense that would threaten our national security. It does nothing to protect the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. And this budget further complicates the tax code by creating five additional income tax brackets.

Americans are in this economic crisis together. We must work together to overcome these challenges that are having devastating effects on our economy, the jobs market, and could seriously hinder the standard of living for the younger generations.

The House budget, the Republican Path to Prosperity, builds upon the bipartisan Fiscal Commission which my bill, the 'Bowles–Simpson Plan of Lowering America's Debt Act,' also does. To be effective, Congress must eliminate waste and restore fiscal discipline to the government. The Simpson–Bowles Commission has given us a framework to implement targeted cuts so we don't have to subject the American people to arbitrary across–the–board–cuts again. The budget before us today is the way to go.

At a time when our country is more than $16 trillion in debt—all of which is saddled on our children and grandchildren—Congress must act to end the years upon years of rampant, runaway federal spending that has occurred under both political parties.

It's Congress' job to pass a budget that is balanced and carefully spends Americans' hard–earned tax dollars. I urge my colleagues to reject the Grijalva amendment and instead implement the House Republican budget, the responsible, balanced budget which builds on the Simpson–Bowles Commission's suggestions, and will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs across America.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–21 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment no. 1 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment no. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment no. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

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

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 261, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—154

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—261

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1446

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, SCHWEIKERT, BARBER, DUNCAN of South Carolina, GOSAR, ROONEY and BARTON, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, NEAL and TONKO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 305, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—105

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Deutch
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—305

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Hurt
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman

□ 1456

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I was detained and missed this vote for the RECORD. I support this amendment and would have voted for it. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 84, the Scott of VA Substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 25, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 84. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 327, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—84

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Tierney
Tonko
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—327

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock

Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–21.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2.569,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,736,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,855,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,977,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,094,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,226,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,394,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,583,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,758,528,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: -$42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$48,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$66,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$71,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$76,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$82,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$88,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$95,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,731,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,637,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,784,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,879,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,949,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,107,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,214,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,321,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,444,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,514,166,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,776,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,691,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,851,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,924,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,060,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,175,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,279,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,430,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,470,191,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: -$538,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$122,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$41,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $52,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $34,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $50,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $114,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $153,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $288,337,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $17,770,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,078,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,314,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,575,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,835,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,150,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,468,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,747,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $19,992,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,141,240,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $12,843,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,061,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,195,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,302,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,381,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,531,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,696,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,839,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,984,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,032,720,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $579,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

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

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $352,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $369,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $406,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $472,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $472,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $540,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $590,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $632,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $657,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $657,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $678,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $688,759,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,819,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,845,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,694,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,758,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,792,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,808,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,803,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,796,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,801,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,891,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,869,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,942,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,928,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,010,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,993,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,094,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,102,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,136,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,120,971,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than May 31, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(B) The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2013, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $42,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and by not more than $685,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

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

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

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

SEC. 302. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

SEC. 303. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

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

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

SEC. 305. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

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

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

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

SEC. 306. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

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

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

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

SEC. 307. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 308. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

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

SEC. 309. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

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

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

SEC. 310. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed.

SEC. 402. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

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

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

(3) Today, there are approximately 70 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

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

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 403. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING FEDERAL REGULATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the cost of regulations on job creators should be reduced by enacting title II of the Jobs Through Growth Act (H.R. 3400), as introduced on November 10, 2011. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should also be enacted.

SEC. 404. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

(1) More than 51 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

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

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

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.4 percent per year on average over the next ten years, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 6.4 percent of GDP by 2035 and 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

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

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution—

(1) to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress; and

(2) that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should be enacted

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

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs, including an option to remain in the traditional Medicare fee-for-service program.

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

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

SEC. 405. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 406. POLICY STATEMENT ON BLOCK GRANTING MEDICAID.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act of 2013 (H.R. 567, 113th Congress).

SEC. 407. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this budget that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 408. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE USE OF OFFICIAL TIME BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR UNION ACTIVITIES.

It is the policy of this budget that, as called for in the Federal Employee Accountability Act of 2013, Federal employees shall not use official time to conduct union activities.

SEC. 409. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.

It is the policy of this budget that a new committee, styled after the post-World War II ''Byrd Committee'' shall be created to act on GAO's annual waste and duplication reports as well as Oversight and Government Reform Inspector General reports.

SEC. 410. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this budget that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 411. POLICY STATEMENT ON READABLE LEGISLATION.

It is the policy of this budget that bills should be made more readable and for Members of Congress and more accessible to the public as called for in the Readable Legislation Act of 2013.

SEC. 412. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this budget that the work requirements in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program should be preserved as called for in H.R. 890, 113th Congress.

SEC. 413. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production. To ensure States' rights, states are given the option to withdrawal from leasing within certain areas of the OCS. Specifically, a State, through enactment of a State statute, may withdrawal from leasing from all or part of any area within 75 miles of that State's coast.

SEC. 414. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

The Environmental Protection Agency is prohibited from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

SEC. 415. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATING A COMMISSION TO ELIMINATE WASTE AND DUPLICATION.

It is the policy of this budget that a new commission styled after the ''Byrd Committee'' shall be established as called for in H. Res. 119., as introduced on March 14, 2013.

SEC. 416. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

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

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

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

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

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

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

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

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

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

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

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

SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

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

SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

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

SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

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

SEC. 509. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

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

TITLE VI—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 601. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

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

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

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

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

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013.

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

SEC. 602. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

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

TITLE VII—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 701. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

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

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

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

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

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

I bring a budget today, a substitute, on behalf of the Republican Study Committee, a budget that balances the Federal budget in just 4 years. It does that, Mr. Chairman, by setting priorities for this Nation, priorities that our constituents back home know need to be set.

I want to begin, Mr. Chairman, by showing you the priorities as they relate to revenue and spending. Within 4 years, we bring revenue above the level of spending so that we can begin to repay our debt and eliminate our deficits for the first time since the Clinton administration, which will bring deficits and revenues in line, Mr. Chairman.

What we do is we prioritize those programs that are important to so many Americans. As you see from this chart, Mr. Chairman, Social Security spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Social Security trust fund; Medicare spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Medicare trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, if a budget is nothing else, it is a statement of our values and our priorities. And the Republican Study Committee's value and priority is to end the passing of responsibilities from this generation to the next, to be responsible for the bills that we create today and pay for those priorities today.

In 4 short years, Mr. Chairman, we can be out of this conversation about debt and deficit and begin the conversation about freeing the next generation from the $16.7 trillion that you and I and previous Congresses have racked up on their behalf.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we had a discussion yesterday and today about different approaches to the budget, and we've had a discussion about the Budget Committee budget, the Ryan budget, that was on the floor and will be voted on later.

That budget, of course, is an uncompromising budget. If you look at this budget, it's even worse. And on top of that, this budget has even more gimmicks than the earlier budget that we talked about.

□ 1510

So what are those gimmicks? Well, first of all, this budget says it comes into balance in 4 years. Look, if you want a race to a fake balance, obviously you should vote for this one over the Republican caucus budget. But the reality is, it gets to that balance by keeping the savings from ObamaCare, which our Republican colleagues say they want to eliminate, that they want to repeal.

You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation did a quick action alert on this budget. Here is what they say: ''Another failing of this RSC budget is that, like the committee budget''—in other words like the principal Republican budget—''it keeps revenues near the levels reached with ObamaCare tax hikes even though it repeals the health care bill's spending provisions.''

So let's just be really clear what that means for the American people. They are repealing the spending provisions. That means they are getting rid of all the benefits in the Affordable Care Act, including the provision to make sure that your child can stay on your insurance policy until they are age 26 so a family is not bankrupted by an accident or some disease that their child gets. It means the provisions that make sure people can't get denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, that is gone. So they get rid of all that, but they keep the ObamaCare taxes. That is what the Heritage Foundation says.

Guess what? They also keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act in the Medicare area that we achieve by ending the overpayments to some of the insurance companies and other changes in the incentive structure. We did it without hitting beneficiaries. They have railed against that in the past, but it is right here in their budget.

And here is the catch: they say their budget gets a surplus in just 4 years. Well, the surplus is $22 billion, they claim. But here is how much of it comes from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. They have got a little under $100 billion in revenue that year coming in, and then they have got Medicare savings. So not close to balance in 4 years without those provisions, which, as the Heritage Foundation points out, are in there.

And do you know what? Even at the 10-year window, even at the end of the 10-year window, they claim to have a $246 billion surplus, and yet they wouldn't get there without the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare.

That's a hoax. To come to the floor and say you will have a balanced budget in 4 years or 10 years, but guess what, you are going to repeal ObamaCare, your budget doesn't work when you do that. That just doesn't add up.

Now, they have another big sort of gimmick in this one that is not in the other Republican budget that has to do with taxes. So the problem with the main Republican budget is that it will provide tax breaks to very wealthy people and help finance those tax breaks by bringing down those rates by raising the tax burden on middle-income people.

As we discussed earlier, we actually put that question to the test in the Budget Committee. We offered an amendment that says: Well, when you do tax reform, don't make it a Trojan horse for raising middle class taxes to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Protect the American middle class from tax increases. A simple amendment. Every Republican on the committee voted ''no.'' So that is their problem with the main Republican budget.

This one has another problem. It creates two tax systems and says: Taxpayer, you get to choose. And then it assumes that they are going to choose the one that is worst for them. Because if they choose the one that is better for the taxpayer, from the taxpayer's perspective they don't have enough revenue in their budget to come to balance.

Now, look, the American people are smart. If you give them two choices, obviously people are going to add them up, and they are going to pick the tax return where they pay less. And if the American people are as smart as I think they are, they will blow another hole in this RSC budget.

So I am not even beginning to talk about the fact that they, once again, more than double the sequester cuts to places like NIH and places where we do scientific research, that they slash our investment in infrastructure. They do all that. They do even more of that than the other Republican budget, but it has the same fundamental gimmick with respect to ObamaCare. And then on top of that, it has this other tax gimmick in it.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, while I regret the Rules Committee didn't give us more time to correct that misinformation, they did give us wonderful speakers. I would like to yield 4 minutes now to a former chairman of the Republican Study Committee, a former chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and thank him for his leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from so many of our colleagues that budgets are about priorities, and I believe this to be true. So what does it say about Democrats' priorities when the President is almost 2 months late in submitting his budget, and Senate Democrats have taken over 4 years to even bother to write a budget?

I suppose it says, Mr. Chairman, that budgets have a way of getting in the way of Democrats as they wish to tax us more, as they wish to borrow more money from China, money our kids have to pay back, and budgets get in the way of Democrats wanting to spend more of our money on a Washington insider economy that doesn't work for the rest of us.

We know that ObamaCare just raised $1 trillion of taxes, much of it falling on working families. The so-called ''fiscal cliff'' raised taxes almost another $700 billion, much of it falling on small business owners who can no longer offer raises, promotions, or even hire new workers. And now all these Democrat budgets are looking for an additional trillion dollars of tax increase on top of that. That comes out to about $9,000 for every working household in America.

Mr. Chairman, that is not fair, that is not helpful to this struggling economy. No nation in the history of the world has ever taxed its way into prosperity. America will not be the first.

Mr. Chairman, no nation has ever spent its way into prosperity; yet the Democrat budgets continue a spending spree that is driving us towards national bankruptcy. A day of reckoning is coming. You cannot have Federal programs going at 2 percent, 4 percent, 6 percent, 8 percent when the new reality under this President is 1½ to 2 percent economic growth, and the family budget, which ultimately pays for the Federal budget, is stagnant.

The families that I represent in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas have several concerns. They want to feel more secure in their jobs. They want to quit seeing their paychecks shrink in the face of higher prices. They want a healthier economy where their success is dependent upon how well they work, not on who they know in Washington. In other words, they don't want a Washington insider economy where they can only succeed if Democrats choose to invest in them.

Mr. Chairman, not every American belongs to a government employee labor union that supported the President in the last election. Not every American has a failing bankrupt solar energy company. So for the rest of them, these hardworking Americans, they want an opportunity, and they want a Main Street economy that, if they work hard and they play by the rules, every American can succeed.

And, finally, the people I represent believe it is just immoral, immoral to saddle our children with this trillion dollars of debt. That is why I am proud to support both the Republican Study Committee budget and the House Republican budget. They will help bring us a vibrant, competitive economy through pro-growth tax reform, a whole new Tax Code which is fairer, flatter, simpler, and more competitive, a budget that is guaranteed to grow jobs and paychecks. And contrary to the Democrat budget, no tax increases on anybody.

□ 1520

We quit spending money we don't have, and I know my Democratic colleague is very sensitive about the balance issue because they have a budget which never balances. The American people demand one; the Republican Study Committee and the House Republican budget deliver it. For a fairer economy, for a balanced budget, for a greater future for our children, we need to support these Republican budgets.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our budget focuses first and foremost on jobs and getting the economy growing. It does balance in the same time that the Republican budget last year balanced. And unlike the Republican budget, the main one, we do not give tax breaks to the folks at the very top financed by increasing taxes on middle class taxpayers.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a great new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle constantly say we should act like families and small businesses who balance their budgets. So let's look at families and businesses in this country.

The fact is that most American families don't have a balanced budget. When you graduate college, you get a mortgage or you go into debt, either way. Many families are suffering through unemployment or underemployment or even foreclosure. When you lose your job or your house, you don't just pack it in and say, Well, I don't have a job anymore, so no more food for me. No, you get your suit cleaned, get out there and interview. You get your résumé professionally printed. You invest in training courses to make yourself more marketable. You spend money to make money.

It's the same thing for businesses. Small businesses are not profitable right away. Businesses take time to pay off a lot of start-up costs like equipment, inventory, insurance, and training. Businesses have to invest to make business work. Sometimes your business goes into a slump. So you train your employees, you buy new inventory and invest in your company so it will grow. You don't just stop investing.

Mr. Chairman, the logic that they use to create this fiction that responsible businesses and families are always in balance is simply not true. Just like folks who are out of work or need to clean their suit and improve their skills, we need to build infrastructure and train our workers. Just like businesses who need new inventory and new ways to sell, we need to find new technologies to build here at home and invest in the education of our future workforce.

The very examples that they use of families and small businesses are simply examples that demand investment, not austerity. You dress for the job you want, not for the job you have. Let's pass a budget that invests in our country, in our future, starting today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in strong support of the RSC budget that we have here today, and I want to talk about a few of the great things that it does to get our economy moving again and get our country back on track.

The first thing that it does, it balances in 4 years. That's right, we really do think it's an important priority of this country that we balance the Federal budget. I have a 6-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, and I don't think that it's asking too much that we balance the Federal budget before they graduate from high school. And so we do that.

What else do we do with this budget? We get our economy moving again through tax reform that's pro-growth oriented and actually lower overall rates and close loopholes so that we can create jobs and be competitive again and get the country moving on track again.

Another thing we do, we save Medicare from bankruptcy. On the current path, according to President Obama's own Medicare actuaries, right now Medicare is scheduled to go bankrupt in 11 years. We don't think it's responsible to let that happen, so we actually put a plan in place to save Medicare from bankruptcy and ensure it for future generations.

We also repeal the job-killing ObamaCare, and not just the policies behind it, but all the taxes, many of which fall on middle class families, by the way. And so that's going to help get our economy moving again.

But let's contrast this vision, this document that's being criticized by my friends on the other side, with the President's budget. What's the President's budget? It doesn't exist. Today the President released his Final Four picks. He released his brackets. He's not a day late on that. Yet, under the law, the President is now 45 days late on releasing his budget. So what kind of set of priorities does that show, the fact that the President doesn't think that it's important enough to meet the legal deadline to file his own budget, he's 45 days late, and yet we know his Final Four picks?

So we have a plan to get the economy moving again. We're laying this plan forward to get a balanced budget and to get our economy moving and start putting some pro-growth policies in place so we can create jobs in this country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to a distinguished new Member from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain my strong opposition to the Republican budget and strong support of the Democrat budget amendment because it offers a balanced approach that is fair to seniors, the middle class, and invests in the right priorities.

I want to give an important example. My district is filled with people from all walks of life—teachers, entrepreneurs, and nurses—who've worked hard and spent their lives earning the Medicare guarantee. They live with the comfort of knowing that if they get sick or injured, the health care they've earned will be there for them. I know this firsthand. My own mother beat cancer with the help of Medicare. Fortunately, I didn't have to make the choice that many Americans will face under the Republican budget: having to choose between helping a parent pay for a cancer treatment or saving for our own children's college tuition.

The Democratic budget, on the other hand, secures Medicare by stopping overpayments to insurance companies and incentivizing efficiency in our health care delivery.

Mr. Chairman, we were sent here to get things done, to solve problems and not to create new ones, and that's why I will proudly vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), one of the visionaries of the Republican Study Committee.

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of reasons that I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget. It repeals ObamaCare. It repeals the death tax. It repeals the alternative minimum tax. It authorizes the Keystone pipeline. It authorizes drilling in ANWR up in Alaska. But the real reason and the primary reason is that it balances, and it balances sooner rather than later.

The first 4 years of the Obama Presidency, our deficits approached $7 trillion. The President has yet to submit a budget that ever balances. None of the Democratic alternative budgets ever balance. The Republican Study Committee balances in 4 years. It reduces the deficit immediately, larger, and it balances.

If I were to come before this body and ask for an amendment to be made in order to spend an additional trillion dollars a year to infinity, I don't think too many people would vote for that no matter what was in it. That's basically what you do if you vote to pass a budget that never balances.

The Republican Study Committee balances sooner rather than later. It balances in 4 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership on these very difficult issues.

Mr. Chairman, if you like sequestration that cuts $1.2 trillion in discretionary domestic spending, you're going to love the Republican budget which actually quintuples that. And then there's the RSC budget that goes even further. So while the Ryan budget cuts almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years in investments, this budget, the RSC, cuts $7.7 trillion. Yes, it cuts funding, as the last speaker just said, but at what expense? At what cost? We are, with this budget and with the underlying Ryan budget, we are disinvesting in America. We are walking away from research and development investments. We're walking away from infrastructure investments.

□ 1530

We are walking away from STEM and education investments. Those are the three legs of a stool that makes a great country great.

George Washington understood that and was a big champion of infrastructure investment and education.

Abraham Lincoln understood that in the midst of the Civil War when he invested, and this Congress invested, in the Transcontinental Railroad, in the Land Grant Research College System, in the Homestead Act, yes, and even completing the dome of this building, because they understood it was important to invest in the future of this country.

These two budgets walk away from that future. In fact, they almost guarantee a bleak future for America with respect to the competition. The Chinese aren't making these kinds of mistakes, we should not either.

I urge defeat of both the RSC budget, Mr. Chairman, and the Ryan budget when it comes up.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to a colleague of mine from the great State of Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed by the sheer ignorance of the economic disaster that our country is facing. Not only are our leaders ignoring this crisis, they're denying there is even a problem.

This week we'll vote on six budget options, and five of them actually increase spending above today's level. Simply reducing the growth of spending will do nothing to address the economic emergency that we face. The idea that we're increasing spending, but not as much as the other guy, is severely misguided.

We have to dig deeper and make real, targeted cuts, and there has to be a sense of urgency about it. Only the RSC budget actually cuts our baseline spending level and will lead to a balanced budget faster than the alternatives.

We must live within our means.

I thank my friend, Congressman WOODALL, for recognizing that we need to cut the outrageous spending and offering this budget today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has the right to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my very good friend from Maryland, the ranking member of our Budget Committee. I thank him for his leadership, and for his common sense, and for advancing approaches that make the right investments in the right priorities in this country, investments that expand the middle class, investments that provide for a balanced approach and reduce our debt.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the RSC budget. As House Democrats, we believe that we need solutions-based budgets, not ideology-based budgets. We need solutions-based budgets that rest on three pillars:

Number 1, they take a balanced approach and reduce debt, because we need to reduce debt, but do it in a balanced way.

Number 2, they protect the middle class, because the middle class is still struggling. Make sure the middle class is protected.

And Number 3, they make the right and smart investments in the right and smart priorities, that don't ask us to forsake research and cures and treatments for disease, that don't allow China to move ahead of us in research and development, engineering, science and technology, that keep us competitive in the world.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. ISRAEL. So we want these solutions-based budgets that achieve these three critical priorities, and the way we get to those three critical priorities is through one thing, and that is compromise. It is the ability of both sides of the aisle to pursue these three priorities in a balanced way.

The budget before us right now is not about compromise, it is about ideology. It is not about common sense and solutions, it is about extremism.

The American people have sent us here to get things done, to find solutions to move them forward.

Let's not go backwards, Mr. Chairman. Let's not continue gridlock, Mr. Chairman. Let's find a balanced approach that rests on compromise and supports the middle class. And that is why I rise today in opposition to the budget before us.

I thank my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a gentleman who came into the House with me in 2010.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you today. And it's very interesting as we sit here and discuss the balanced approach.

How do you have a balanced approach, Mr. Chairman, if you can't have a balanced budget?

There are two different visions here. You either trust the people in Washington who have given us $16.7 trillion of debt, or you trust the American people.

What the RSC budget does is trust the American people with their money by taking back the big tax increase that was given to us in January, by taking away the big ObamaCare controls that were given to us in 2010, and actually returns that power to the States and to the people, and actually balances the budget in 4 years.

This is real progress. This is a returning to what the American people demand. And what we need to create growth and prosperity in America is to pass these types of budgets.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I'd inquire of my friend if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, we do not.

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

Mr. Chairman, you and all Members can find every word of this budget on the Internet at rsc.scalise.house.gov. This isn't just about trying to go through the math. This is about laying out priorities. That's what every budget is.

This budget provides flexibility to States to care for our poor and our underserved in our health care communities. This budget provides the flexibility to seniors to find doctors, doctors that are no longer taking Medicare today and are threatening the health care quality that folks like my mom and dad are having to contend with.

This is a budget that makes tough decisions. You're not going to find a family in this country, Mr. Chairman, that hasn't had to make tough decisions during tough economic times. And the question is, why won't the U.S. House of Representatives, why won't the U.S. Senate, why won't the United States President do exactly the same thing?

We're trying to fulfill that request of the American people today, Mr. Chairman, in this budget. Every word laid out right here talking about, Mr. Chairman, responsible budgeting, prioritizing, as we did, our seniors who are counting on Social Security, our seniors who are counting on Medicare, our seniors who are counting on the solvency of both of those programs.

We ensure that that does not continue, Mr. Chairman, because solvency is not guaranteed. In fact, it's guaranteed not to be there under current funding systems. We change those systems to ensure that it will be a sustainable path, Mr. Chairman, a path where revenues and spending align, radical idea for this Chamber. And you'll hear it described in radical terms by my friends, where spending and revenues align. We commit ourselves to that, and we achieve it.

They say that talk is cheap, Mr. Chairman. That's why we back up this budget with real ideas, real proposals, real solutions. But when they say talk is cheap, and as my colleague from Maryland begins to close, I want to observe that talk, in this case, is not cheap at all.

The words that you'll hear from the gentleman from Maryland, in opposition to our proposal, in support of his proposal, are the difference between the $33 billion surplus that our budget generates and the $5.11 trillion deficit that the gentleman's proposal creates.

These are not questions of math, Mr. Chairman. These are questions of what kind of future do we want to leave to our children and our grandchildren. I feel the burden of responsibility for the $16.7 trillion this Nation has already put on its credit card. We take difficult steps in this budget to begin to reverse that for the first time.

In the absence of this budget, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of powerful ideas, like what you see in the House Budget Committee budget, we relegate our children to a second-class future, a future in which they owe $5.1 trillion more than the already immoral debt load that they face today.

□ 1540

There is a better way, Mr. Chairman. There are alternatives in this town. We are presenting one right here. It's called the Back to Basics budget, Mr. Chairman. It's a product of the Republican Study Committee.

To close, Mr. Chairman, these things don't happen by themselves. While the President has been unable to produce a budget, we've produced five in this house. It's because of the work of folks like Nick Myers on my staff. It's because of the work of folks like Will Dunham on the RSC staff. I know the gentleman from Maryland has the same kind of hardworking team working with him. These things don't happen in a vacuum. They happen because folks put in hour after hour after hour. I'm grateful to them. I hope America will support the product of their minds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think the American people know full well that the best way to attack the deficit right now is to help put more Americans back to work. That's the sense in this country and that's what all the numbers show from the Congressional Budget Office.

If you take the austerity approach recommended in either this budget or the main Republican budget, we know from the referees, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that we'll see 750,000 fewer jobs just by the end of this calendar year. We also know you'll see 2 million fewer jobs next year, which is why we say let's focus on the jobs deficit and address the budget deficit in a sustained way where we bring it down in a balanced way, where we ask for shared responsibility and not another round of tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

And yes, we achieve balance in the same year the Republican budget last year achieved balance, but our priority is getting the country fully back to work.

We also believe that when we put together these budgets, we shouldn't pretend that you can have it all ways. And as I have said repeatedly, the Republican budget, including this RSC budget, is based, on the one hand, on the claim that it gets to balance in 4 years—one, in 10 years—but at the same time that they're repealing ObamaCare, and that just is not the case. It doesn't add up.

So if you're in a race to fake balance, then you should vote for this one because it gets to fake balance in 4 years instead of 10 years. But if you're in a race to put America back to work, you should vote for the Democratic plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia, Mr. WOODALL. I commend him on authoring this substitute amendment on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

At a time when we have over $16.5 trillion in debt, this budget reduces spending by $6.5 trillion over ten years and reduces deficits by $5.9 trillion. Furthermore, the Woodall amendment completely repeals ObamaCare, and it rolls back the tax increases associated with the fiscal cliff. In doing so, this budget decreases taxes by $685 billion over the budget window.

Mr. Chair, unlike any other of the substitutes offered today, the RSC budget will achieve balance by 2017 without holding funding for our servicemen and women hostage. This budget also significantly reforms our entitlement programs so we can ensure their long term solvency for future generations.

Mr. Chair, I believe that this is a sensible budget that puts the proper priorities in line. I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 132, answered ''present'' 171, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—104

Amash
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cassidy
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—132

Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Ellmers
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Joyce
Kelly
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schrader
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—171

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Clarke
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Foxx
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Matheson
Meng
Miller, George
Perry
Peterson

Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	
Schock	Wasserman	

□ 1606

Messrs. SALMON, MARCHANT and ROE of Tennessee changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. BARROW of Georgia and SCHRADER changed their vote from ''present'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio and COOPER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 86, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, my vote on rollcall 86 did not reflect the way I intended to vote. I wished to vote "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I was not present during the rollcall votes Nos. 76–86, on March 18–20, 2013. I would like the record to reflect how I would have voted: On rollcall vote No. 76 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 77 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 78 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 79 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 80 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 81 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 82 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 83 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 84 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 85 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 86 I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade adjustment assistance.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extension of expiring health care provisions.
Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for early childhood education.
Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability and completion.
Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.
Sec. 211. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Sec. 212. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional tax relief for individuals and families.

TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 301. Direct spending.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 402. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 403. Costs of emergency needs, Overseas Contingency Operations and disaster relief.
Sec. 404. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 405. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 406. Reinstatement of pay-as-you-go.
Sec. 407. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy of the House on jobs: Make it in America.
Sec. 502. Policy of the House on taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction.
Sec. 503. Policy of the House on Social Security reform that protects workers and retirees.
Sec. 504. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
Sec. 505. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 506. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
Sec. 507. Policy of the House on overseas contingency operations.
Sec. 508. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 509. Policy of the house on tax reform to replace the sequester and reduce the deficit.
Sec. 510. Policy of the House on agriculture spending.
Sec. 511. Policy of the House on the use of taxpayer funds.
Sec. 512. Policy of the House on a national strategy to eradicate poverty and increase opportunity.
Sec. 513. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the reduction of unnecessary and wasteful spending.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $1,982,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,242,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,693,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,903,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,032,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,162,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,287,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,428,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,606,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,807,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,996,779,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$55,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$28,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $87,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $124,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $128,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $134,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $138,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $144,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $149,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $157,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $164,634,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,117,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,982,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,020,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,230,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,416,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,611,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,975,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,149,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,383,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,540,638,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,966,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,038,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,088,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,255,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,396,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,563,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,754,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,935,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,120,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,359,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,500,492,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$983,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$796,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$394,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$351,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$364,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$400,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$466,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$506,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$514,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$551,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$503,713,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $17,158,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,142,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,519,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,996,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,567,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,340,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,340,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,215,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,702,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,141,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $14,589,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,065,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,616,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,858,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,558,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,232,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $559,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,639,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $54,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,430,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,021,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,950,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $39,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,935,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,721,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$30,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $150,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $109,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $116,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $96,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $102,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,921,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,870,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $160,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $83,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $92,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $102,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $115,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $120,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $116,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $117,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $119,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $121,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $124,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,856,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $365,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $420,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $501,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $555,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $612,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $649,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $733,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $765,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $764,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $808,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $857,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,154,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $511,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $527,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $735,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $863,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $863,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $895,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,764,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $544,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $538,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $538,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $545,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $557,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $571,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $598,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,842,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $47,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,848,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $146,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $59,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $63,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $65,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $71,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $73,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,433,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $37,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,056,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $331,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $343,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $371,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $419,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $607,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $681,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $681,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $748,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $748,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $803,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $803,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $856,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $904,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $904,907,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$16,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$26,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$31,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$29,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$33,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$39,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$37,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$44,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$42,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$49,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$46,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$54,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$51,947,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that protects workers and supports jobs by reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

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

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

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

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

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

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

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''clean energy jobs'');

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

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

(1) enhances the delivery of health care to the Nation's veterans;

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

(5) makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare;

by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

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

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. When 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than to administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(c) HOME VISITING.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable and increases college completion, including: efforts to reform Federal student aid policies to ensure that subsidized student loan interest rates do not double in July 2014 at the end of the one-year extension of the current 3.4 percent interest rate assumed in the resolution; or efforts to ensure continued full funding for Pell grants, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 211. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 301. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

(3) The resolution retains the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

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

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the

total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending: For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(1) for fiscal year 2015 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2016, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

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

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

SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates $9,753,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $1,018,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that appropriates $60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $20,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2014.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 403. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

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

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2013 or fiscal year 2014 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2013 or the 2014 level for Overseas Contingency Operations in the President's 2014 budget and the new outlays resulting from that budget authority.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b) and (c) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 404. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

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

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

SEC. 405. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 406. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 113th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

(1) (A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms ''budget year'', ''current year'', and ''direct spending'' have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ''direct spending'' shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4) (C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) a bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 407. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007 that was worsened by a financial crisis in 2008 – by January 2009, the private sector was shedding 821,000 jobs per month;

(2) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010, with the economy creating 6.4 million private jobs over the past 36 consecutive months;

(3) multi-year across-the-board spending cuts under sequestration will cost Americans millions of jobs with up to 750,000 jobs lost this year alone, slow economic growth by up to one third this year alone, and impair our global competitive edge;

(4) as part of a ''Make it in America'' agenda, U.S. manufacturing has been leading the Nation's economic recovery as domestic manufacturers regain their economic and competitive edge and a wave of insourcing jobs from abroad begins;

(5) despite the job gains already made, job growth needs to accelerate and continue for an extended period for the economy to fully recover from the recession; and

(6) job creation is vital to Nation-building at home and to deficit reduction – CBO has noted that if the country were at full employment, the deficit would be about half its current size.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ''Make it in America'' agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the U.S., and help middle class families by increasing the minimum wage.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) assumes enactment of legislation to replace sequestration under the Budget Control Act of 2011 with at least the same amount of deficit reduction from a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing that tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

(B) assumes enactment of—

(i) the President's $50 billion immediate transportation jobs package;

(ii) other measures proposed in the American Jobs Act and reflected in the President's 2013 budget; and

(iii) the President's proposed surface transportation legislation;

(C) assumes $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps;

(D) assumes $80 billion in education jobs funding for the President's initiatives to promote jobs now while also creating an infrastructure that will help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion for rebuilding at least 35,000 public schools, $25 billion to prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs, and $8 billion to help community colleges train 2 million workers in high-growth industries with skills that will lead directly to jobs; and

(E) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements and support for biomedical research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) every bipartisan commission has recommended, and the majority of Americans agree, that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

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

(1) the Congress should vote on H.R. 699, which would replace the sequester for calendar year 2013 with a balanced mix of targeted and better timed spending reductions and revenue increases to prevent the loss of jobs and the drag on economic growth in the near term; and

(2) the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Social Security is America's most important retirement resource, especially for seniors, because it provides an income floor to keep them, their spouses and their survivors out of poverty during retirement – benefits earned based on their past payroll contributions;

(2) in January 2011, 56.8 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of about $15,000, which is the majority of total retirement income for more than half of all beneficiaries;

(4) diverting workers' payroll contributions toward private accounts undermines retirement security and the social safety net by subjecting the workers' retirement decisions and income to the whims of the stock market;

(5) diverting trust fund payroll contributions toward private accounts jeopardizes Social Security because the program will not have the resources to pay full benefits to current retirees; and

(6) privatization increases Federal debt because the Treasury will have to borrow additional funds from the public to pay full benefits to current retirees.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Social Security should be strengthened for its own sake and not to achieve deficit reduction. Because privatization proposals are fiscally irresponsible and would put the retirement security of seniors at risk, any Social Security reform legislation shall reject partial or complete privatization of the program.

SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security;

(2) in 2012, 50 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system;

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(6) shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both; and

(7) versions of voucher or premium-support policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely cause traditional Medicare to weaken and wither away.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve families' health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;

(2) the Affordable Care Act signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to 27 million Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefitting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

(4) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health cost-containment provision experts recommend, including new incentives to reward quality and coordination of care rather than simply quantity of services provided, new tools to crack down on fraud, and the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and as a result will slow the projected annual growth rate of national health expenditures by 0.3 percentage points after 2016, the essence of ''bending the cost curve''; and

(5) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than $1,000,000,000,000 over the next 20 years.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million senior citizens, 10 million people with disabilities, and 14 million other low-income people who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

(2) senior citizens and people with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid program spending and consequently would be at particular risk of losing access to important health care assistance under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and people with disabilities facing significant costs for long-term care; and

(4) at least 70 percent of people over age 65 will likely need long-term care services at some point in their lives.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable Americans provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014.

SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none and the size and the structure of our military have to be driven by a strategy;

(2) those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them;

(3) a growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development;

(4) 750,000 jobs will be lost in calendar year 2013 if the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration remain in effect, hampering the economic recovery and jeopardizing the foundation of our security,

(5) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

(6) the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force concluded that a serious and balanced deficit reduction plan must put national security programs on the table;

(7) in 2011, the U.S. spent more on defense than the next 16 countries combined (and more than half of the amount spent by those 16 countries was from seven NATO countries and four other close allies);

(8) Admiral Mullen argued that the permissive budget environment over the last decade, a period when defense spending increased by hundreds of billions of dollars, had allowed the Pentagon to avoid prioritizing;

(9) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense — the last department still unable to pass an audit — such as the elimination of duplicative programs that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office;

(10) effective implementation of weapons acquisition reforms at the Department of Defense can help control excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and help ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(11) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(12) weapons technologies should be proven to work through adequate testing before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(13) the Pentagon's operation and maintenance budget, which now totals $200 billion per year, has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area;

(14) excluding those involved in war operations, 200,000 military personnel and their dependents are stationed overseas, and the Administration should further review the benefits and costs of alternatives to permanent overseas basing of personnel;

(15) more than 94 percent of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce since 2001 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense (31 percent), Department of Homeland Security (32 percent), Department of Veterans Affairs (26 percent), and Department of Justice (6 percent)—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

(16) proposals to implement an indiscriminate 10 percent across-the-board cut to the Federal civilian workforce would adversely affect security agencies, leaving them unable to manage their total workforce, which includes contractors, and their operations in a cost-effective manner; and

(17) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

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

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs;

(2) further savings can be achieved from the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our security strategy; and

(3) veterans programs are fully funded and if there is new information provided in the President's 2014 budget that would justify the need for funds in excess of the amount reflected in section 102(15), adjustments shall be made from within the discretionary totals to meet any such new requirements.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER AND REDUCE THE DEFICIT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the sequester represents a meat-ax approach to cutting government spending and will cost the economy 750,000 jobs in 2013 alone, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office;

(2) the House must therefore replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction that would raise revenues in addition to making targeted spending cuts;

(3) this balanced approach to deficit reduction must include overhauling our outdated

tax code –which contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests – to make it simpler, more progressive, and more competitive;

(4) these special tax breaks can greatly complicate the effort to administer the code and the taxpayer's ability to fully comply with its terms, while also undermining our basic sense of fairness;

(5) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(6) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes;

(7) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is badly in need of reform, and it proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way;

(8) even Speaker Boehner indicated that he has a plan that would raise an additional $800 billion in revenues through closing tax loopholes and eliminating special interest tax breaks.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to help reduce the deficit and replace the sequester through a balanced approach that includes limits on tax expenditures and tax breaks for very high-income individuals. This resolution expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-class taxpayers. This resolution also expressly rejects raising taxes on middle-class taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes below $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples) and reflects the tax rates and income thresholds established in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. This resolution therefore encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue needed through closing loopholes and ending tax breaks for special interests and the very wealthy, consistent with key proposals made by both the President and the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures.

(B) This resolution supports working families, encourages increased labor force participation, and boosts access to higher education by permanently extending the expansions to the child tax credit, the EITC, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit, respectively, first legislated under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

(C) This resolution extends policies that reinvest in domestic manufacturing to bring jobs back to our shores; builds up the renewable energy production capacity of the United States in order to limit our reliance on foreign oil while creating green jobs; expands access to higher education, which everyone agrees is essential for building up a highly-skilled workforce and building out the middle class; and supports saving and capital formation that will raise future standards of living.

(2) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution proposes eliminating unproductive or unwarranted corporate tax preferences and subsidies, as well as pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs – rather than products – overseas for tax purposes.

(B) This resolution adopts pro-growth corporate tax incentives like those in the President's FY 2013 budget proposals, such as: enhancing incentives for domestic manufacturing to support a ''Make it in America'' agenda, including providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move operations and jobs overseas; closing loopholes that allow businesses to avoid taxes, by subjecting more of their foreign earnings sheltered in tax havens to U.S. taxation; the research and development credit; and enhancing clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the President's proposals for business tax reform in determining how to best overhaul our corporate tax code so that it promotes economic growth and domestic job creation without increasing the deficit and the debt.

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The committee should also find ways to focus assistance toward struggling family farmers and ranchers in a manner that creates jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

SEC. 511. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barber shop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

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

(1) The prospect of upward mobility should be the right of every American.

(2) Targeted, means-tested Federal programs help lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

(3) These programs empower their beneficiaries through job training, educational assistance, adequate food, housing, and health care to rise to the middle class.

(4) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts over 4 million people out of poverty, including over 2 million children. It is particularly effective in keeping children – over 1 million – out of deep poverty (below half the poverty line). School breakfast and lunch programs help keep children ready to learn, allowing them to reach their full potential.

(5) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit together lift over 9 million people, including nearly 5 million children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed a major EITC expansion in 1985 and then referred to the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which included the expansion, as ''the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress''.

(6) However, some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Citizens of these areas often lack access to quality schools, affordable health care, and adequate job opportunities.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to support the goal of developing a national strategy to eliminate poverty, with the initial goal of cutting poverty in half in ten years, and to extend equitable access to economic opportunity to all Americans. As Congress works to protect low income and middle class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that millions of American families rely on to get by, priority must be given to creating a national strategy on poverty to maximize the impact of anti-poverty programs across Federal, State, and local governments. Improving the effective coordination and oversight across agencies and implementing a true unity of programs under a ''whole of government'' approach to shared goals and client based outcomes will help to streamline access, improve service delivery, and will strengthen and extend the reach of every Federal dollar to fight poverty. The plan should consider additional targeting of spending toward persistent poverty areas to revitalize these areas of pervasive poverty, unemployment and general distress. The plan must also include provisions that work to remove the barriers and obstacles that prevent the most vulnerable Americans from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities and moving up the ladder of opportunity to join the middle class and reach for the American Dream.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

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

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

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

(3) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified opportunities for savings and improved efficiencies in the Government's information technology infrastructure.

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

(5) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2014, 42 laws will expire. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be changed.

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1610

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, today we are offering a budget with commonsense solutions that first focuses on the issue that's most pressing for the country and the American people today: kicking our economy into higher gear and putting more Americans back to work.

We know from the Congressional Budget Office—the professionals—that one-half of this year's deficit is due to the fact that millions of Americans are still looking for work and that three-quarters of next year's deficit is because we're not at full employment.

Our budget goes to the heart of the issue. It attacks the jobs deficit because we know we can't get the budget deficit under control until people are back to work and we take a balanced approach to long-term deficit reduction where we ask for shared responsibility.

We do ask people at the very high end of the income ladder to give up some of the tax preferences and tax breaks they have in order to help reduce the deficit. It's very different than the Republican budget that doesn't close one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Theirs only lowers tax rates for folks at the very top by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans. We don't do that.

We make sure that people can get back to work by replacing the sequester, which we know will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working at the end of this year. We also have a jobs program investing in this country, especially in the area of infrastructure, to help rebuild our aging infrastructure and build the modern infrastructure that's necessary to compete in the 21st century. Those measures will make sure that, compared to our Republican colleague's budget, we have 1.2 million more Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million more by the end of next year.

We also make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors. Unlike the Republican budget, we don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, which will mean seniors with high prescription drug costs will have to pay thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget, and we don't turn Medicare into a voucher program that leaves seniors facing the risks and costs of escalating health care costs in the future.

We make sure that students don't face a doubling of the interest rate in July, scheduled to go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Republican budget keeps that doubling of interest rate in place. We don't.

We fully fund the transportation program for the next 10 years. The Republican budget cuts it by 20 percent, even at a time when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, we get at the budget issues by putting more people back to work, by dealing with this in a balanced way. We reduce the deficit way down so it's growing much slower than the economy. We stabilize the debt, and we balance the budget in the same time period that the Republican budget for the last 2 years had balanced the budget, but our focus is on jobs and the jobs deficit as a way to tackle the budget deficit.

With that, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague and friend, the distinguished whip from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. I first want to thank the ranking member for the work that he's done on this budget that he offers as an alternative.

It is a reasonable alternative that can be implemented. To that extent, it's a stark difference to the majority's proposal, which will not be implemented, and they know it.

Let me start with an observation, a headline, ''Blunt Report Says GOP Needs to Regroup for '16.''

In that, there is this sentence from the report. It's not from a Democrat, not from the newspaper, not from an editorial writer. It says, ''We have become expert''—''we,'' being the Republican Party.

We have become expert in how to provide ideological reenforcement to like-minded people.

With all due respect to my friend, Mr. RYAN, that's what his budget is: it is a vision. It is a vision that will not be implemented, and he knows it.

He knows that the Appropriations Committee will not be able to report out bills consistent with his budget, nor will the Ways and Means Committee come even close to reporting out bills that will implement his budget. Why? Because they're so draconian. And as I have said before, if every Democrat were taken out of this House and every Democrat taken out of the Senate, you would not implement the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has put together a balanced plan. Yes, it has revenues, and, yes, it keeps the Affordable Care Act in place, and, yes, it provides for funding for investment in growing our economy.

Mr. RYAN knows—and I have great respect for Mr. RYAN. I have great respect for his intellect and, frankly, from time to time, for his political courage. We voted together on TARP. It was a tough vote for him. It was a tough vote for me. It was a tough vote, period. But it was the right vote for the economy. We would have been in a depression had we not voted for that bill, and I congratulate Mr. RYAN on doing that.

But I'll lament the fact that we do not have an equally honest but tough resolution of a big deal in how to get from where we are—too much debt, too much deficit—to where we need to be: a fiscally sustainable path.

We will not get there, I tell my friend, by vision alone. Courage will be much more important than vision in that case. And Mr. VAN HOLLEN has shown courage by offering a budget that will provide for our people, for our country, and for our economy.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative. Why? Because it is a responsible, fiscally implementable—there's a word for you—fiscally doable alternative.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. Ezra Klein, who may not be your favorite writer, says:

Ryan's tax reform plan costs more than all his spending cuts combined.

That's why I say it can't be implemented. And if we were in private and there were no politics involved, I think my friend would admit that. He shakes his head ''no.'' I didn't expect anything different than that.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an important statement of vision. It's an important statement of what our priorities are. It's an important statement to the American people, to seniors, to students, to families, to children where our priorities are.

The Van Hollen priorities are the right priorities for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative.

□ 1620

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I enjoyed my friend from Maryland, and I appreciate his attempt to speak on my behalf. I will just try to do that myself. There is one thing that is identical in this budget—the base budget—and the Senate budget: it's the appropriations No. 966. It's the one thing that is equal in both the House and the Senate budgets.

The reason I rise in opposition to this budget, unlike what the gentleman just said, is that there is no way this could pass. I would say the opposite. Why? This budget never balances the budget.

You will hear Mr. VAN HOLLEN claim that, in 2040, because of certain assumptions they, on their own, make and that cannot be verified by the CBO, they think they'll balance. It never, ever balances the budget. Here is why:

We are going to go from a $16-plus trillion debt to a $25 trillion debt in this budget—period. What does this great budget do? It shaves $612 billion off the debt. It has a $1.2 trillion tax increase. It has a $476 billion spending increase. We've got a $1 trillion deficit. We're piling debt as high as the eye can see, and they bring a budget to the floor that is increasing spending?

Let's look at every budget offered by the other side: a $1.2 trillion tax increase by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and a $476 billion spending increase; the Congressional Black Caucus has a $2.8 trillion tax increase with $1.1 trillion spending increase; the Progressive Caucus—that's the doozy of them all—has a $5.7 trillion tax increase with a $4.065 trillion spending increase.

Here is the theme:

Take more money from the economy; take more money from families; take more money from small businesses—spend it in Washington, and hope everything works out.

It's not working out.

Families are struggling because of this borrowing, because of this debt. We need to reject this amendment and go with something that works, and that means balancing the budget to get a healthier economy to create jobs, which is precisely what our budget does.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 2013]

HOW THE HOUSE BUDGET WOULD BOOST THE ECONOMY

(By John F. Cogan and John B. Taylor)

This week the House of Representatives will vote on its Budget Committee plan, which would bring federal finances into balance by 2023. The plan would do so by gradually slowing the growth in federal spending without raising taxes.

Still, the plan has been denounced by naysayers who assert that it would harm the economic recovery and that, at the least, any spending reductions should be put off until later. This thinking is just as wrong now as it was in the 1970s.

According to our research, the spending restraint and balanced-budget parts of the House Budget Committee plan would boost the economy immediately. With the Budget Committee's proposed tax reform included, the immediate impact would be even larger. The entire plan would raise gross domestic product by one percentage point in 2014, equivalent to about a $1,500 increase for each U.S. household. Ten years from now, at the end of the official budget horizon, we estimate that the entire plan would raise GDP by three percentage points, or more than $4,000 for each U.S. household.

Our assessment is based on a modern macroeconomic model (developed with Volker Wieland of the University of Frankfurt and Maik Wolters of the University of Kiel) whose features include a recognition that the resources to finance government expenditures aren't free—they withdraw resources from the private economy. The model provides for other essential attributes of the economy—that consumers, businesses and workers respond to incentives, and they are influenced by their expectation of future economic conditions when making decisions today. None of these features is provided for in old-style Keynesian models.

The House budget plan keeps total federal outlays at their current level for two years. Thereafter, spending would rise each year, but more slowly than if present policies continue. By 2023, federal expenditures would decline to 19.1% of GDP in 2023 from 22.2% today.

Since the Congressional Budget Office projects that revenues will equal 19.1% of GDP in 2023, the House plan will balance the budget that year. Also by 2023, the publicly held federal debt relative to GDP would decline to 55% from its current high level of 76%.

The House budget is hardly austere: The federal spending claim on GDP would still be considerably higher than it was in fiscal 2000 (18.2%) and only slightly below its claim on GDP in 2007 (19.7%).

The reductions in the growth rate of spending are to be achieved primarily through entitlement reforms. The Affordable Care Act would be repealed. Medicaid and food-stamp administration would be turned over to the states. Medicare would be fundamentally reformed. Anti-fraud measures would be applied to federal disability programs. Among the major entitlement programs, only Social Security would remain unchanged; this is a deficiency in the plan. As for discretionary spending, the House budget plan would provide for only slight reductions from the levels that are set by the budget sequester.

The long-run economic gains from restraining government spending would not, despite what critics claim, harm the economy in the short run. Instead, the economy would start to grow right away. Why?

First, the lower level of future government spending avoids the necessity of sharply raising taxes. The expectation that tax rates won't need to rise provides incentives for higher investment and employment today.

Second, since the expectation of lower future taxes has the effect of raising people's estimation of future disposable income, consumption increases today. This change comes thanks to Milton Friedman's famous ''permanent income'' hypothesis that the behavior of consumers reflects what they expect to earn over a long period. According to our macroeconomic model, the higher level of consumption induced by the House budget's effect on consumer expectations is large enough to offset the reduced growth of government spending.

Third, the new budget's reduction in the growth of government spending is gradual. That allows private businesses to adjust efficiently without disruptions.

Still, our macroeconomic model likely underestimates the positive impact of the House budget plan. The model doesn't account for the greater economic certainty that results from preventing the national debt from soaring to dangerously high levels and from stabilizing the federal tax burden. Nor does the model account for beneficial changes in monetary policy that could accompany enactment of the budget plan. Lower deficits and national debt would reduce pressure on the Federal Reserve to continue buying longterm Treasury bonds.

The U.S. economy has been experiencing its slowest recovery from a deep recession in modern history. Tragically, fewer people are working as a percentage of the working-age population than when the recovery began—and economic growth was only 1.6% last year. The large federal budget deficits—by increasing uncertainty and delaying private spending—are an important cause of this lackluster economic performance.

For too long, policy makers have been misguided by models that lend support to bigger government or to the politically convenient objective of delaying any reduction in spending. It is better to recognize the flaws in this approach and get on with the sensible budget reforms the country so sorely needs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think, if you ask the American people, they know what the challenge is right now. It's getting the economy back in full gear, and they're struggling because too many of them can't find a job, and the Republican budget will make that even worse. That's not me saying it. That's not a Democratic economist saying it. Those are the professionals at the Congressional Budget Office saying it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't have enough time. On your time, I'm happy to, my friend, but I can't do it right now.

Let me say another thing, Mr. Chairman, with respect to balance. It's really interesting.

One of the reasons the Republican budget that last year came into balance in 2040 and the year before was able to balance this year is that the increase in per capita health care costs has come down significantly, in part because of the Affordable Care Act and the changes in incentives. In fact, if you applied much more reasonable assumptions to our proposals than the Congressional Budget Office applied to the Republican budget last year, you'd get balance. I know our Republican colleagues don't want to hear it. Now our focus and our priority is on dealing with the jobs deficit. That is the best way to reduce the long-term deficit and to do it in a balanced way.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished assistant Democratic leader, my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you so much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget.

The Ryan budget ignores the express will of the American people and doubles down on the ''you're on your own'' Republican platform that the voters soundly rejected just a few months ago. Rather than taking a fair and balanced approach to deficit reduction, the Ryan budget will kill millions of jobs, slash needed investments, raise taxes on working families, and create big, new tax breaks for the wealthiest few. The Ryan budget will block grant Medicaid, voucherize Medicare, and rip up the safety net that's at the heart of the social contract in this country. There are many words that can be used to describe the Ryan budget, but the one word that cannot be used is ''balanced.''

I am pleased that the Democratic alternative and the CBC budget that we voted on both include versions of a proposal I have worked on for several years. We call it the ''10–20–30.'' The purpose of the 10–20–30 plan is to target Federal funds to communities that have experienced persistent poverty. Specifically, this proposal targets 10 percent of funding to neglected communities where 20 percent or more of the population has lived in poverty for 30 or more years.

The 10–20–30 plan was originally signed into law as a part of the Recovery Act. It has proven to be successful in steering needed rural development funds into neglected communities for water and sewage and economic development projects. It's time to build on this success and expand the 10–20–30 plan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you.

I am also pleased that all of the Democratic substitutes reject the austerity-for-working-families plan that the Republicans are proposing. Democrats will honor our commitment to senior citizens and invest in a brighter future. The Van Hollen budget will create jobs now, and that's the tried and true way to achieve deficit reduction.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we are stealing from the next generation—our kids and our grandkids. We are making false promises that Medicare and Social Security benefits will be there to take care of folks when we know that Medicare is bankrupt in 8 to 12 years. It's time for Congress to do something to help Americans and their families.

While House Republicans seek to bring taxes and spending back to historically stable levels this country operated under for the past 60 years and seek to balance the budget, there is nothing balanced about the Democrats' plan. We are spending more money today than we did last year, and we are collecting more taxpayer dollars than ever before. Instead of cutting spending, the Democrats' plan would add $4 trillion to the debt and take in another $1.2 trillion out of people's pockets, not to buy down our debt, but to spend even more.

Instead of raising taxes, the House Republican plan includes pro-growth, comprehensive tax reform. Tax reform is critical to increasing U.S. competitiveness abroad as well as attracting business here at home. It will close loopholes and special interest deductions and credits for personal and corporate income taxes and lower the rates for everyone.

I am pleased House Republicans are the only people in this town with the courage to balance the budget. It's time to return the economy to an engine of growth and job creation and to increase opportunities for all hard-working Americans. This is what the House Republican budget will achieve, and this is what Americans deserve.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The way to save Medicare is to bring down costs overall in the health care system, not give seniors a voucher that puts all the risk on the senior, which is what the Republican approach does.

I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, a budget shows our priorities for financial expenditures but our moral priorities as well. There are many reasons to oppose the Ryan budget, but what it does to Medicare and Medicaid are on the top of my list.

They would end Medicare as people have known it. Rather than have a guaranteed benefit, they turn it into a voucher. There would be no guarantee that people would be able to get the services they need and get those benefits provided to them under this voucher. Every year, that voucher would be capped, so they would have to buy a cheaper and cheaper policy with fewer and fewer benefits.

For Medicaid, the Ryan budget cuts $810 billion, ending the coverage for over 70 million Americans: 17 million are seniors or people with disabilities, and 33 million are children, for whom we want to have at least a chance of starting life in the best of health. They would make this into a block grant, cutting $110 billion, shifting the cost on to the States, on to the providers, on to the beneficiaries. They don't hold down costs. They simply shift them.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say that I think that people know over here that we're not proposing a voucher plan. The premium support is quite different, and it's the only bipartisan solution to save and strengthen Medicare.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership as well as to thank all of the members and staff of the Budget Committee.

We have a good product here. It balances. Balance is important because, until you balance, you can't even begin to start paying off this debt, and we do that. The budget that's on the floor right now never balances. It might claim it does, but the math bears otherwise.

□ 1630

I want to address the Medicaid reforms that we put in our budget, because they were just attacked. We believe in balancing the budget. We believe in balancing, not by raising taxes, but by cutting spending. But you don't just have to cut to cut spending. You can reform.

You can reform these programs, Mr. Chair, so that they are around for the generations to come. Medicaid, a program that by all accounts is failing those whom it is intending to serve, needs reform. It leads to poor outcomes for patients.

A 2010 study suggested that surgical patients on Medicaid were 13 percent more likely to die, Mr. Chairman, than those without health insurance at all. That bears repeating. If you're a surgical patient on Medicaid, you are 13 percent more likely to die. That needs reform.

It drives away doctors who want to serve the poor. On average, doctors who participate in Medicaid earn 56 percent of what those in the private sector do. It also is pushing our States closer and closer to the brink of fiscal collapse. States on average now spend more on Medicaid than on any other expense, including K–12 education, Mr. Chairman. And the dramatic expansion of Medicaid under ObamaCare will only make these problems worse.

We have to address these failing programs. The States are doing it already. In Rhode Island, with the help of a waiver from the Federal regulations, they are able to take a cap in spending for 5 years and put everyone in managed care successfully. In my home State of Indiana, 40,000 more people who really needed the care were put on without one more dime of expense.

Mr. Chairman, reform is needed, reform cuts costs, and reform will make sure these programs are around for generations to come. Please do not support this budget. Support the Ryan plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana just made the point that under the current Medicaid system States have lots of flexibility, including Indiana, to help bring down costs. But when you have a tight program, cutting another $820 billion is not a lifeline; it's throwing them an anchor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds simply to say that Indiana is being denied their waivers, so they're being denied the flexibility they are asking for to run Medicaid as they see fit to serve their populations. Point made.

I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the House majority party for putting together a budget that takes a balanced approach. It balances the interest of two very future vulnerable groups.

One is my age, because in 11 years I'm going to be on Medicare and Medicare is going to be broke, completely insolvent, absolutely broke.

At the same time, earlier today, I met with some kids who were here with the Close Up program. They were high school students full of hope. In 11 years, they're going to be starting families, buying cars and gasoline and houses and insurance and raising kids; and they'll be at a financially vulnerable age.

Now, the House Republican budget protects both of us. It makes Medicare solvent for me when I am there and I need the money. And it doesn't do it on the backs of those young high school students today that will be 28-years-old when they need to be raising families and saving for their children's college and their own retirements. It doesn't with the premium support system, not a voucher system, a premium support system, which is what I have as a Member of Congress, where I get to choose from among government pre-approved insurance programs that don't deny me for a preexisting condition. I pay part of the premium and the government pays part of the premium. The healthy and wealthy get less premium support, the unhealthy and unwealthy get more.

It solves both parties. It's the balanced approach. I ask you to reject the minority party's budget and support the House Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished Democratic leader, who just returned from the Vatican and hopefully will bring some hope from the Pope, as I say.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Mr. Chairman, for his tremendous, tremendous leadership and giving us an opportunity in the House today to vote on a budget that is a reflection of American values—values of work and jobs, promoting them, a value of fairness, a value of advancing the success of America's families. I thank him for giving us a budget—I think we can all be the judge—where we say that a budget is a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a Nation is a place where we allocate our resources.

This budget is in stark absolute contrast to the Republican budget that is on the floor today.

Contrast number one: jobs. The Republican bill, the Ryan Republican budget, is a job killer. Nearly 2 million jobs lost right out of the gate, and more lost after that; whereas the Van Hollen Democratic substitute is a job creator. It invests in rebuilding the infrastructure of America. It invests in innovation, energy, and education. Speaking of infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers has given us a D in terms of the condition of the infrastructure in our country. So the need is there. This budget recognizes that need, but it also does so in a way that creates jobs in a very innovative way.

It is in strong contrast when it comes to fairness, fairness as to how we, again, establish our priorities to invest in education, rather than continue to give tax breaks, loopholes that are unnecessary, unworthy of a values budget that the Republican budget continues.

And in terms of our seniors, the contrast could not be greater. The Ryan budget, in 10 years there will be no Medicare guarantee—flat out, absolutely. There will be no Medicare guarantee.

In the meantime—in the meantime—the Ryan budget takes the resources that we have in the health care reform bill, repeals the bill, and takes the money and runs to give it to his priorities, rather than strengthening Medicare and keeping it strong for a longer period of time, keeping the benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act, prevention and wellness services right from the start, closing the prescription drug doughnut hole, and the list goes on.

I listened intently to the gentlelady speak about our high school 18-year-old seniors and where they'll be when they're 28 years old. And since young people are always used as sort of a point of discussion, and rightfully so—we're here to provide for their future—I think it's important to listen to what they have to say.

And the young people that have passed through the Capitol—as you know, many do—I frequently invite them to sit down and tell me what they would like us to say at the table of the discussion of the budget—especially when it comes to them—because we always say we cannot heap mountains of debt on the next generation. I fully agree. That is why I support the Van Hollen budget.

These young people say, We want a strong education system, a strong public education system. We need student loans that are affordable. We need Pell Grants. We need our families to be able to focus on us, and so we need Medicare and Medicaid so that our grandparents' health needs are met.

For a long time to come, they hope, loving their grandparents. But these young people want to be helpful in solving the budget crisis. That's what they have told us: We want to do our share.

The initiative that brings more money to the Federal Treasury is education—education, early childhood, K–12, higher education, post-grad, all the rest of that lifetime learning.

□ 1640

Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than educating the American people, and that is why investing in education, creating jobs, that brings revenue. It's hard to see why we would put forth a budget that stunts the growth of jobs, the growth of our economy with jobs and our investments in education.

On the subject of education, tens of billions of dollars are struck in the Ryan Republican anti-job bill, in that job-killer bill, tens of billions of dollars. They say, it's better to give a tax break to a special interest than to invest in the education of our children.

Would that be a statement of your national values if you were writing a budget for our country? I don't think so. It certainly was not a statement of the values of the young people who have come through here saying how they would help solve the budget deficit challenge we face.

We all know the deficit must be reduced. We've known it for a long time. We've recognized it for a long time. President Clinton recognized it and took us on a path of soundness.

It was totally reversed in the Bush years when our Republican colleagues didn't say a word. They said, no problem; it's the appropriate percentage of GDP. No problem with the deficit. They never complained about it.

But now, with their initiatives, the Ryan Republican job-killer budget is making matters worse in terms of reducing the deficit because it deprives our economy of the very initiatives that would create growth, the education of our people, lifetime learning for the American people.

Investments in education, as I said, nothing brings more money. Investments in jobs, whether it's infrastructure, energy, innovation—absent in the Ryan Republican job-killer budget.

Medicare, so important to the stability of America's working families, the provisions in the Affordable Care Act that affect Medicare have already demonstrated that it is halting the rapid increase in the cost of health care spending, and so that is what has enabled the CBO to say, with more promise, that we can use a different baseline to reduce the deficit, and that has been used in the Republican budget.

So I urge my colleagues to think about the kitchen tables of people in our country. We sit at a table here and have these discussions. What's really important is how the decisions we make here, what we think, and how that relates to the challenges they face, the education of their children, are they going to be able to keep their home, keep their job, keep their pension, all of this heaped one on top of another of concerns.

And the economic and health security of our seniors not only has an impact on them, the seniors, but on their families. And if we're going to be true to those young people, those 18-year olds, we must recognize how important their education is, but also, how important caring for their grandparents is to the economic success of their entire family.

I'll end where I began. The most important part of all of this is this issue of jobs, jobs, jobs, and the fairness in our budget to promote jobs and to reduce the deficit for the success of America's families.

The choice is clear: Job-killer Ryan Republican budget bill, job-creator Van Hollen substitute bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'm just not going to agree with that one, Mr. Chairman. I'll yield myself 30 seconds.

The minority leader says she's concerned about the debt that is befalling the next generation. I'm glad to hear that. Doing nothing, the debt will go up by 56 percent if we just do nothing.

If this budget passes, the Democratic substitute, it will go up by 54 percent. That's basically doing nothing as well.

Jobs: the CBO statistic the gentleman talks about, it's not even an estimate of this budget, it's the sequester.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another 10 seconds.

But the Stanford economist who did look at this Republican budget says that we will create 500,000 jobs in the first year and 1.7 million each and every year by the end of this budget window. Faster economic growth, more jobs, getting the government to live within its means, balancing the budget.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, today we're not talking about balancing a budget for the sake of balancing a budget. The goal is not to just check a box. What we're discussing today is about more than just this procedure of a budget. We're debating the kind of future that we're going to leave our kids.

Today, the choice is clear: if Congress does not get spending under control, our Nation faces a debt crisis that will only make our financial situation worse. House Republicans did recognize this and the urgency of the hour, and we acted.

I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to produce a budget that does make responsible reforms, promotes economic growth and job creation. The House Republican budget does balance in 10 years and gets our Nation back on track.

The Democrats' budget doesn't balance at all within CBO's budget window, and it includes a $1.2 trillion increase in taxes. Our budget reforms the Tax Code and lowers taxes for everyone.

Hardworking Hoosier families sit around their kitchen tables today, tonight, this evening, and make tough choices to keep their budgets. Our households and businesses work hard to live within their means, and the Federal Government should do the same.

The basic principle of keeping budgets is important to all American families. When I'm home in the Second District in the State of Indiana and I'm in the grocery store on Saturday mornings, there are moms that come up to me and they're worried about the rising cost of eggs. They're talking about the price of a gallon of milk.

They're concerned about whether their kids will have a future. Will they really go to college? Will there be jobs for them when they come out of college? Will there be jobs for them if they don't go to college? What happens when they do enter the workforce?

The truth is this: the uncertainty in Washington is what burdens our families at home. It's time for us in Washington to be accountable and pass a responsible budget.

According to Stanford University, in addition to what the chairman mentioned, their economists said that this Republican budget would result in $1,500 more for each household in 2014 and $4,000 more for each household by 2024.

Our budget includes commonsense policies that will spur investments and job creation and roll back the regulations that hurt businesses and stifle economic growth.

History will be our judge by the future that we leave to our children. If we refuse to make responsible, serious decisions about this budget, we'll jeopardize the American Dream for future generations. We have to ensure that our children have the same, if not better, opportunities to succeed than we have.

I urge my colleagues to make a responsible decision, oppose this amendment, and support the House Republican budget.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I support the Van Hollen budget because it recognizes that reducing our deficit is important, and that fiscal restraint, spending cuts, more revenues in a balanced way, is the way to do that. But I also support it because it chooses American economic growth over the European-style austerity.

Prior to 1965, in this country, when you got old and retired, you moved in with your kids and hoped you didn't get sick. And only the very lucky or the very wealthy got to go to college.

In 1965, two things changed. We adopted Medicare that said that retired people had health security, and we adopted the Higher Education Act that said that sons and daughters of truckdrivers and teachers could get a college education.

What happened?

Prior to 1965, on a per capita basis, our economy grew by $323 per person per year. After 1965, our economy grew by $523 per person per year. Investing in Medicare, investing in education yields growth.

The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantees and will severely raise the cost of going to college for American families. Vote "yes" on the Van Hollen plan.

□ 1650

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Little do some know that ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. VAN HOLLEN recently pointed out that Democrats and Republicans both want to get rid of a range of tax loopholes but Democrats want to spend that money and Republicans want to lower the overall burden. That difference is very important.

We have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. That's the principle reason why we're losing American jobs to nations with much lower taxes. As economist Arthur Laffer has warned, there's nothing more portable in this world than money.

This policy might fit the left's "eat the rich" crusade, but the jobs it destroys are eating our middle class alive. We are sacrificing permanent, upwardly mobile, productive private sector jobs for makeshift subsidized ones that disappear the moment the money runs out. That is precisely the difference between FedEx and the post office or between Apple and Solyndra. And that's all the difference in the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire again how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The fundamental choice here is whether we want a budget like the Democratic budget that focuses on economic growth and strengthening the middle class or whether you want to take a budget like the Republican budget that imposes European-style austerity by more than doubling the size of the sequester on essential investments to help the economy grow. Investment in our infrastructure, when we know we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry. Investment in our kids' education, not doubling the student loan interest rate in July, as the Republican budget would do. Investment in science and research. If we don't make those investments, our global competitors are going to eat our lunch.

And yes, we do ask the very wealthy to get rid of some of their tax breaks and loopholes to help contribute to the reduction of the deficit so that we can reduce the deficit in a balanced way that calls for shared responsibility. And no, we do not ask middle-income families to pay higher taxes in order to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. And yes, we get the deficit down in a steady way. We balance it in the same year the Republican bill balanced last year, and we don't pretend that we're going to balance and get rid of ObamaCare at the same time. That's fake balance, not real balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this green graph shows you the revenues we've historically had in America. The blue line shows you the tax increases our friends are hoping to achieve, some of which have already occurred. The red line shows you where spending is going. We have a spending problem. But the time my kids are my age, the government will be taking twice as much money to spend on the Federal Government.

Austerity is what you do when you have a debt crisis. You raise taxes and you cut spending on seniors to try and please the bond markets to stop the panic. That's the path we're on. What we're trying to do is prevent austerity.

What do we propose? Let's grow the economy. Let's reform the tax system. Let's stop picking winners and losers through loopholes, lower tax rates for everybody—families and businesses—to create jobs and economic growth. Let's open up the resources we have in this country—oil, coal, and gas—so we can bring down gas prices, increase paychecks, create jobs, help manufacturing.

We have a safety net that isn't working. We have the highest poverty rates in a generation. There are 46 million people in poverty. We need to fix this safety net so it works to get people back on their feet again. We need to save Medicare so that it's not bankrupt—because it is on a path to bankruptcy—so that current seniors can rest in comfort knowing it's not going to be taken away from them, so that the ObamaCare rationing board won't take it from them, and so that those of us who are younger can plan for it.

We need to balance the budget. Balancing the budget is necessary for a healthy economy, for creating jobs, and for giving our kids a debt-free Nation. That's why we do this. Their budget, despite what they say, never, ever balances. The budget the Senate is considering today never, ever balances.

The budget that they're talking about here, the budget that they're passing in the Senate, it actually has a net spending increase. And don't forget the fact that taxes just went up by $1.6 trillion. What do they want to do? Throw another trillion on top. Guess what? They may say it's for the rich. They may say it's for the loophole. Watch out, middle class. The tax man is coming to you. Because that's exactly what all these deficits and all these tax increases are pointing at—taking more out of the paychecks of hardworking families. We're going to balance the budget and stop that from happening. That's why I urge a defeat of the Van Hollen substitute and passage of the base bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I support the Democratic budget. It is a responsible roadmap that invests in our future and approaches deficit reduction in a balanced way. It accomplishes this without singling out domestic energy production with unfair tax provisions.

I cannot support the Republican budget. It cuts taxes for the wealthy and pays for it by raising taxes on middle income earners and betraying our commitment to our seniors. It is misguided and does not reflect the values Americans hold dear.

The Republican budget slashes Medicaid, which provides necessary care to our nation's most vulnerable, especially low-income seniors and children. Denying them the care they need does not make the costs go away, it just shifts the burden on to doctors, hospitals, non-profits, and others.

The Majority budget repeats the same tired and failed tactic of repealing the Affordable Care Act. Repeal increases the deficit and means Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs, receive less preventive care, and bring back the days of abusive insurance companies capping coverage and denying coverage to those with pre-existing conditions.

Alternatively, the Democratic budget makes good on the commitments we have made to our Seniors. It makes sure that the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented and that the benefits are maximized to protect patients and begin to bring down the cost of healthcare. This budget also provides the necessary funding for medical research, which will spur the innovations of the future that end disease and improve outcomes.

Additionally, I appreciate the Ranking Member for making education a top priority in this budget. Investing in education is key to growing our economy, strengthening the middle class, allowing for upward mobility and ensuring our children and grandchildren have brighter futures than previous generations. Robust early education programs, jobs initiatives and financial aid programs to make college more affordable invest in our future and build a stronger America in the long-term. Making it harder for out-of-work Americans to get job training or for families to access quality early learning programs undermines the strength of our workforce and diminishes our ability to compete in the global economy.

Spending on domestic programs is already on track to be at the lowest level as a percentage of the economy since the 1960s, but the Ryan budget would make even deeper cuts. It imposes spending caps on non-defense programs for two additional years at a level that is $700 billion below the level set by the Sequester. It slashes billions of dollars in mandatory funding for Pell Grants and allows interest rates on student loans to double this summer at a time when student loan debt is nearing $1 trillion and is the only type of household debt that continued to rise through the Great Recession. We should be working to help Americans who seek to better their livelihood through higher education rather than allowing them to be crushed by debt or denied access due to skyrocketing costs.

Under the Ryan budget, students will face larger class sizes, more debt, fewer afterschool programs, and less support for special needs. Robust funding for educational investments is critical to growing our economy. Cutting these programs shortchanges our future and threatens the ability of our children to pursue the American Dream.

Finally, I want to thank our Ranking Member on the House Budget Committee and Democratic Leadership for not including provisions in this budget that would unfairly single-out and punish our domestic energy industry by repealing tax provisions for them that are afforded to any business operating in our country. The oil and natural gas industry is one of the largest employers in our country, supporting more than 9.2 million jobs. In fact, this industry delivers $86 million a day to the federal government in revenue. Any changes to these tax incentives should be addressed in the context of comprehensive tax reform and not a budget.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, let me thank our Ranking Member, Congressman VAN HOLLEN.

As a Member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Alternative Budget to the disastrous Republican Budget.

The Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes to raise the critical revenue we need to create 1.2 million new jobs, and make key investments in education, health care and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Alternative not only fully funds the SNAP program, it includes language that calls for the creation of a National Strategy on Poverty.

Democrats understand that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and promote job creation and economic growth.

Finally, the Democratic Budget eliminates off budget spending in the Oversees Contingency Operations slush fund to stop our cycle of perpetual wars and bring our troops home safely.

The Democratic Budget offers a balanced alternative to the failed economic and fiscal policies of the Republican majority.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic Budget.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 253, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—165

Andrews	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Bass	Brady (PA)	Carney
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Castor (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Castro (TX)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Chu

Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—253

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Amodei
Engel
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Schock
Smith (NJ)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1718

Messrs. COFFMAN and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1720

THE NATIONAL FAB LAB NETWORK ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013. I introduced this bill because America needs a well-trained workforce for advanced manufacturing.

When I go home, people ask me, Where are the jobs? But when I talk to manufacturing groups like the Tooling & Manufacturing Association in Illinois, they tell me there is a mismatch between job openings and students and workers with the right skills to fill them.

Fab labs can help bridge that skills gap. Fab labs are workshops equipped with computer-controlled machine tools that allow children and adults to build almost anything. The first fab lab was started at MIT, and they have spread worldwide.

My bill would create a Federal charter for a nonprofit organization called the National Fab Lab Network. This chartered status would be similar to that enjoyed by Little League Baseball or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. My bill would help American manufacturers fill job openings and encourage students to become more active in STEM fields, all at no cost to taxpayers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this initiative and to cosponsor the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013.

AMERICA'S NATURAL GAS REVOLUTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, science is beginning to prevail in the debate over America's natural gas revolution, and it's time to begin telling the real story of what it means for all Americans.

Just 7 years ago, America was facing the fact that we would have to import an increasing amount of natural gas to fulfill our domestic demand. Today, new technologies have enabled us to access previously inaccessible energy resources, and almost overnight America's energy resource picture flipped from deficit to surplus.

In the past 5 years, we've become stronger as a Nation through the development of these God-given resources. As a result, we're more competitive. From the low-income to the high tax brackets, everyone is benefiting.

The future is bright, but only if we educate, dispel myths and half-truths, and begin telling the real story of America's natural gas revolution and what it means to all Americans.

The story is about technology, private sector innovation, investment, financial risks, thousands of new jobs, new competition, new growth, a growing and better standard of living for more Americans, lower energy costs, new industries, a revitalized manufacturing sector, more growth, more jobs,