



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

No. 50

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 25, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALEXANDER X. MOONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Tim Crumpton, Cleburne County Baptist Church, Heber Springs, Arkansas, offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, thank You, Almighty God, for the promise in Your holy Word that says whosoever believes in Your only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, has everlasting life.

Thank you, Lord, for the freedoms and blessings that still remain in our great country. Thank You for those that stood strong for the Biblical principles that have shaped us, and also for those that fought for these principles that have kept us free.

Lord, please forgive the sins of our Nation. Your Word promises: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Lord, please help this Congress and their families. When each item of legislation is presented, help these men and women to seek Your wisdom and perform their duties ethically, remembering always the people they represent and also Your principles that have continued to preserve this country.

In the name of Jesus Christ I pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GOHMERT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND TIM CRUMPTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend, Pastor Tim

Crumpton of Heber Springs, Arkansas, for his service today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

I have personally had the pleasure of knowing Pastor Crumpton for the past several years, and I am humbled by the leadership that he has shown his community through his dedication to God and Scripture.

Ever since he was a young man, Pastor Crumpton has been involved in various ministries, and he holds a bachelor's degree and master's degree in Christian education. In 1995, he began traveling with his family, preaching in children's ministries, Christian youth camps, and singing in churches throughout the States and several countries abroad. Today, he serves as the pastor of the Cleburne County Baptist Church in Heber Springs, Arkansas.

Tim and his wife, Shannon, met at a youth camp and will be celebrating their 25th wedding anniversary next month. They have five children, one daughter-in-law, and one grandson.

Please join me in thanking Pastor Crumpton for leading us in prayer as today's guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1903

of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, March 19, 2015, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MOHAMMAD ASHRAF GHANI, PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOOX);

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURA);

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE);

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF); and

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); and

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Dr. Alia Hatoug Bouran, the Ambassador of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His

Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

(Applause, the Members rising.)
President ASHRAF GHANI. In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate, Speaker BOEHNER; Vice President BIDEN; Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL; House Majority Leader MCCARTHY; House minority leader, Ms. PELOSI; Senate minority leader, Mr. REID; ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, please allow me to thank you for your gracious invitation to address this unique forum of deliberative democracy.

Above all else, I would like to begin by thanking the people of the United States, whose generous support for my country has been of such immense value in advancing the cause of freedom.

More than 1 million brave Americans have served in Afghanistan. They have come to know our snowcapped mountains, our verdant valleys, our windswept deserts, our parched fields, our unharnessed, flowing rivers, and our plains of waving wheat.

But more important than knowing our geography, they have come to defend and to know our people. And in return, the people of Afghanistan recognize the bravery of your soldiers and the tremendous sacrifices that Americans have made to keep Afghanistan free.

We owe a profound debt to the 2,315 servicemen and -women killed and the more than 20,000 who have been wounded in service to your country and ours. We owe a profound debt to the soldiers who have lost limbs to buried bombs, to the brave veterans, and to the families who tragically lost their loved ones to the enemies' cowardly acts of terror.

We owe a profound debt to the many Americans who have come to build schools, repair wells, and cure the sick. And we must acknowledge with appreciation that at the end of the day, it is the ordinary Americans whose hard-earned taxes have over the years built the partnership that has led to our conversation today. I want to thank the American taxpayer and you, their representatives, for supporting us.

The service of American men and women—civilian or military—in our country has been made possible by the bipartisan support of the Congress of the United States. On behalf of our own parliament and people, I salute and thank you. It has always been a pleasure to receive and interact with Congressmen and -women during your visits to Afghanistan. Please do come again and again, and if you are reservists, please come in your proud uniforms. I had a unique opportunity that, when Senator GRAHAM was dressed as a colonel, I asked him to salute a three-star British general, and he complied. So thank you.

Veterans will always be welcome in Afghanistan. Our deepest hope is that the time will come when Americans visiting our country see the cultural

heritage and natural riches of the Bamiyan valley; the ancient Timurid architecture of Her-at and Mazar-e-Sharif; the fishing streams of Badakshan and Takhar; the forests of Khost, Kunar, Nuristan, and Paktia; and the ancient architecture of Farah, Helmand, and Nimroz, not as soldiers, but as parents showing their children the beautiful country where they served in the war that defeated terror. On behalf of my entire country, when that day comes, you will be our most welcome and honored guests.

America's support to Afghanistan has been led by a succession of remarkable generals. I am proud to have known and worked with Dan McNeill, David McKiernan, Stanley McChrystal, David Petraeus, John Allen, Joseph Dunford, and John Campbell. Their commitment and dedication is inspirational. These generals lived in simple quarters. They worked tirelessly through the night. And their leadership of their troops has set an example that our generals are working hard to follow.

Your civilian leaders are no less inspirational. Ambassadors such as Ronald Neumann, Zal Khalilzad, Karl Eikenberry, Ryan Crocker, James Cunningham, and my good friend Michael McKinley give American diplomacy first-class leadership and strategic understanding. And I would be remiss not to mention the stimulating conversations with my friends from this Chamber, like JOHN MCCAIN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, Carl Levin, and many of your visitors. But I must also acknowledge the deeply appreciated contributions of the aid workers and NGOs who are the day-to-day representatives of your country. I have met people from all 50 States of the Union, from Senators and Representatives to construction workers and computer operators. I want to thank all of them for introducing the best of America to the people of Afghanistan.

And finally, I would like to thank President Obama. He is an admirable and principled partner. His support for Afghanistan has always been conditional on our performance. I like and appreciate his clear and disciplined approach to American engagement. Thanks to his strict rigor, we were encouraged and supported to build up the Afghan Armed Forces into the self-reliant army that it is today. Because he stood firm on the deadline for the surge and the transition, the U.S. Army pulled off a logistical near miracle, first deploying and then withdrawing more than 100,000 soldiers without a hitch and timed to deadline. And it is thanks to his promise to America to end active combat that we saw a seamless handover of responsibility for all combat operations from your side to ours on December 31, 2014.

U.S. soldiers are no longer engaged in combat. But we are delighted to have them in the train, assess, and advice mission.

Tragedy brought our two countries together, but it is our shared interests

and values that will keep us together. September 11, 2001, was not a distant image that I watched on the emotionless screen of television. It was horrific, and it was personal. I was in my office at the World Bank when the first plane smashed into the World Trade Center and forever changed the lives of each and every one of us.

New York is a special place for me and my family. My wife and I are both graduates of Columbia University. I was another beneficiary of Americans' wonderful generosity that has built so many longstanding friendships through its unparalleled universities. I ate corned beef at Katz's, New York's greatest, greasiest, pickle-lined melting pot.

Close friends were working near the Trade Center. My children were born in New York City, and my daughter was living in New York when the Twin Towers fell. I visited Ground Zero that very week. Seeing firsthand the tragedy and devastation drove home the realization that after 9/11, the world would never be the same. I went home knowing that America would seek justice, and I began to write the plan for our national reconstruction.

Indeed, justice came swiftly. Al Qaeda terrorists were killed or driven underground. The Taliban, acknowledging their losses after the initial encounters, quickly vacated the cities, with their leadership moving to Pakistan and their rank and file returning to their villages.

There was considerable anxiety about how the Afghan people would respond to the American presence. The issue was put to rest by the welcome accorded to the American soldiers and civilians as partners. Even today, despite the thankfully rare if no less tragic "green on blue" incidents by Taliban infiltrators, the overwhelming majority of Afghans continue to see partnership with the United States as foundational to our future. There is no better proof of this than last October's overwhelming and immediate parliamentary approval of the bilateral security agreement and the status of forces agreement, both of which testify to our desire to continue the partnership.

Afghanistan has been the front line of the global battle against extremists. America, as a result, has been safe, but that safety has been ensured through the loss of American and Afghan lives in the fight against terror.

We have made great sacrifices—we Afghans—but then it is our patriotic duty to do so. You, on the other hand, had a choice; and when you came to a fork in the road, you chose to do the right thing.

Thank you.

Most recently, due to the refusal of our previous government to sign the bilateral security agreement and the status of forces agreement with NATO, we had lost momentum, and both partners had to operate under uncertainty, resulting in some 8 months of lost time

in the most critical moment of transition.

You could have used this opportunity to end the partnership and return home in frustration, but you did not. Thanks to the flexibility shown by President Obama and Congress, we have made up for the loss and have regained momentum without breaking, by even a day, the promise of President Obama to the American people that the U.S. combat role would end on December 31, 2014.

Thank you for staying with us.

I would like to talk a little about our partnership because it is evolving. We are starting to balance the focus on security with a new emphasis on the rule of law and justice, growth, and the pursuit of peace and reconciliation.

The framework for our future relationship is defined by our Strategic Partnership Agreement and the bilateral security agreement. On your side, you have reaffirmed your commitment to support Afghanistan. On our side, we will focus on self-reliance. To get there, we have initiated reforms that will create a self-sustaining Afghanistan.

I know the American people are asking the same question as the Afghan people: Will we have the resources to provide a sustained basis for our operation? The answer is: within this decade, we will.

As the current phase of our relationship draws to a close, our appreciation for the depth of America's contribution to our people cannot be measured in words alone, but it can be seen quite literally in the number of Afghans whose futures have been changed thanks to America and its allies.

On September 10, 2001—this will no longer shock you—there were no girls enrolled in school in Afghanistan. It was illegal to educate girls. Today, more than 3 million girls in primary schools across the country are learning to openly and actively participate in the future of a democratic Afghanistan.

Their parents thank you.

In 2002, when the allies built their first clinics, the average lifespan of the ordinary Afghan was 44 years. Today, it is over 60.

Their children thank you.

Today, the rate of maternal mortality in our poor country remains unacceptably high, but thanks to the immense effort you have made to build clinics and to train nurses, an Afghan woman is no longer more likely to die because she gives birth to a child than if she had somehow fought on the front line of combat.

Their husbands and their children thank you.

Our partnership with America and its allies has brought our country hope where we had none. We would, once again, like to thank you for that wonderful gift from your people to ours, the gift of hope; but, in Afghanistan, there is a saying that no gift can remain unreciprocated.

Today, I would like to return that gift of reborn hope by offering the

American people a partnership with a nation that is committed to the cause of freedom and that will join the fight against the growing threat of terrorism.

I will use my remarks today to tell America the history of how a future Afghanistan came to be. It is a story about how a poor country that relied on foreign help became a self-reliant nation where free trade and the rule of law let Afghan businesses create jobs and prosperity for its people. It is also a story about how a country that had been ravaged by conflict became a platform for peace and regional stability and prosperity.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story about Afghanistan's path to self-reliance has already started. It began with last year's election and the formation of our national unity government. Afghanistan's external image is of a traditional country that has been frozen in time; but my partner and the CEO of Afghanistan, Dr. Abdullah Abdullah, and I ran intense and passionate campaigns on the most modern of issues, such as the need to end corruption, taking the actions that will build transparency into government, and guaranteeing support for the impartial rule of law. Campaigns became forums for public debate.

In the final election, not only did more than 7 million Afghans turn out to the polls, but more than 38 percent of the votes were cast by women, many of whom had never previously had the chance to speak politically with their own voices.

There is no denying that the election was hard fought, but in the end, we chose the politics of unity over the politics of division. The national unity government brings together all parts of the country to make the government the arena where disputes are raised and resolved.

Dr. Abdullah and myself may not initially agree on every issue, but we both believe deeply that spirited debate will produce better outcomes than will confrontational stalemate. We not only work together, we like working well together.

The Afghanistan country, to world perception, is well suited to democracy. Like Americans, Afghans are individualists. None of us defers to anyone else. We have neither had caste nor class, so persuading each other is an art form.

Our key characteristics are our openness and hospitality. We believe in equality. Even in the most traditional parts of the country, our leadership must earn rather than inherit their positions. There is a strong public conscience. People are expected to act for the common good. We love debate.

Ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to introduce you to Afghanistan. We are an old country with a proud heritage and a history of trade with our neighbors. We have had bills of exchange for at least 2,000 years, and our women could write 2,500 years ago. For

at least three millennia, we have been a hub for the caravans and trade networks that spread across Asia, bringing Chinese silks and Indian textiles to ancient Rome and Renaissance Italy.

The 19th century disrupted this world, as it did in so many other places. Afghanistan became an isolated buffer caught between two expanding empires. The emergence of the Soviet Union further isolated our country, culminating in the 1979 invasion and the subsequent war of resistance.

Today, however, the isolation is over. First, awareness is growing that Afghanistan is, quite literally, the heart of Asia. Asia cannot become a continental economy without us. Asia, in the next 25 years, will have its 1869 moment—the year that the East and West Coasts of the United States were joined through the transcontinental railway—but this completion of a new, interconnected Asia cannot happen without us. We are in the midst of 3½ billion people, and we should be able to export something and not just import.

Our fragmented geography can once again become the opportunity for integrating central, west, east, and south Asia into a network that supports stability and prosperity over a vast swath of the world's surface. Diplomatic efforts to advance integration can free up cross-border trade and support multicountry investments in energy, transport, and water; and this, again, is beginning. The first major project between central Asia and south Asia, called CASA 1000, for transmitting energy from Kyrgyzstan to Pakistan is already underway.

I truly believe that diplomatic efforts backed by the leaders of our countries will build the peace and prosperity for south and central Asia in the same way that the common market has done so for Europe and ASEAN has done for our neighboring region to the east. We envisage an Afghanistan that in 20 years has become a hub of trade and gas pipelines, power transmission lines, railways, modern telecom, and banking services; but American support for all of these is essential, and we thank you for that commitment.

Ladies and gentlemen, if one story of our future history is bright, there is another, darker cloud that is making its way towards our country. Afghanistan's security transition took place against the backdrop of the unexpected rise of religious extremism in the Middle East. The promise of the Arab Spring gave way to the emergence of Daesh terror and collapse of states, but the changed ecology of terror could have not formed without some states tolerating, financing, providing sanctuary, and using violent, nonstate actors as instruments of shortsighted policies.

It is critical that the world understand the terrible threat that the Daesh and its allied forces pose to the states of western and central Asia. Terrorist movements, whose goal is to destabilize every state in the region, are

looking for new bases of operation. We are the front line, but terrorists neither recognize boundaries nor require passports to spread their message of hate and discord. From the west, the Daesh is already sending advance guards to southern and western Afghanistan to test our vulnerabilities. To the south, Pakistan's counterinsurgency operations, in which more than 40,000 people have already died, are pushing the Taliban from South Waziristan toward Afghanistan's border region.

Criminalization of the economy is an indispensable part of this new ecology of terror. Control over the narcotics trade is providing the financing for these groups to find weapons and recruits, blurring the lines between criminal economics and criminal politics.

Each of these groups poses a clear and present danger to our neighbors, to the Arab-Islamic world, and to the world at large. Afghanistan is carrying forward everyone's fight by containing this threat. But extremism is becoming a system, one that, like a dangerous virus, is constantly mutating, becoming more lethal, very media savvy, well financed, and thriving on state weakness and an overall lack of regional coordination.

To date, Afghanistan's people have rejected the allure of violent movements. We are willing to speak truth to terror.

Military fighting may stem the advance of extremism, but it will not put an end to the anger and hatred being promulgated across Muslim majority countries by these groups. That hatred must be challenged and overcome from within the religion of Islam.

The heart of the issue remains who is entitled to speak for Islam. Leaders, intellectuals, and those many millions of Muslims who believe that Islam is a religion of tolerance and virtue must find their voice. Silence is not acceptable.

But silence is not what the world will hear from us. Afghanistan is joining a new consensus that is emerging in the Muslim world, a consensus that rejects intolerance, extremism, and war. Scholars such as Fredrick Starr have documented beautifully central Asia's long tradition of rationalism and scientific inquiry. During Islam's Golden Age, Muslim scholars synthesized and recorded all known knowledge of the medieval world, giving the world advances in algebra, astronomy, water resource management, printing, and positive science. This is the Islamic civilization that needs to reinvent itself.

The Islamic world must understand its own gloriously tolerant and inquisitive past. It must reengage with the world openly and without paranoia of encirclement.

We, the unity government of Afghanistan, know that Islam is a religion of peace. We are responding to extremist threats by building partnerships at the global, regional, Islamic, and national levels of governance.

Globally, Afghanistan abides by international conventions and the rule of law. We are staunch supporters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is firmly embedded in our Constitution, obliging the state to achieve these rights for our citizens. We are committed to supporting our independent human rights commission, and I am pleased that Dr. Sima Samar, a tireless champion of human rights, is a member of this delegation and is today sitting in the audience of this great Chamber. And our government will join the free trade system and harmonized investment rules that build prosperity and promote peace.

Regionally, we are engaging our neighbors across Asia to build trust and trade. Afghanistan will become a platform for cooperation in a vast region that extends from India to Azerbaijan and beyond. We have already made significant headway in making the vision of the Lapis Lazuli Corridor that will link us to Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey, and Europe into a reality. Thank you, Members of Congress, for wearing Lapis Lazuli.

The Arab Islamic world, from Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Iran, is keenly aware of the new threats, and we hope they will soon agree on a regional framework for cooperation. The recent declaration of a Council of Ulema across the Muslim world may well be a historic turning point in building that alliance.

Condemnation of terror by this largest gathering of Muslim Ulema is an unprecedented step in acknowledgment of the shortcomings of Muslim majority country governments.

Properly supported, Afghanistan is uniquely positioned to block the spread of extremism. We have none of the historical inferiority complexes that fuel the resentment against Western domination. After all, we defeated most of the empires.

With the bitter exception of the aberrant Taliban regime, Afghan Islam has traditionally been inclusive and reflective, not violent and angry. And after 36 years of conflict, our people are well-vaccinated against the seduction of ideologically based conflicts.

Our people, our children, desperately want to be normal. Ordinary is what has escaped us—and we would really like to be leading ordinary lives: to go to school and come back, to shop without being blown up, to play volleyball without being attacked. So many children I have held in my arms who have been mutilated. That must not be permitted and cannot be permitted and will not be permitted.

For Afghanistan to oppose the violence of extremists, we must turn our sights to the struggle to end the conditions that give rise to extremism in the first place. Our effort begins with the frank recognition of our problems and the challenges that we must tackle with determination and commitment.

Nearly 40 years of conflict have produced a country where corruption per-

meates our government. Until we root out this cancer, our government will never generate the trust to win the hearts of our people or the trust of your taxpayers. We will eliminate corruption.

On our second day in office, we tackled the notorious case of Kabul Bank, which for years had lay in abeyance. I am pleased to report to you that all the court systems of Afghanistan, including the supreme court, has now made a decision against these thieves and has allowed us to collect from them. And we will collect and get the public purse refilled.

Ladies and gentlemen, ending corruption and impunity are the precursors of self-reliance, but the true test will be whether we can restore the fiscal basis of public expenditure. We must create an environment where private investment, sustainable natural resources, and critical market-linking infrastructure development provide our youth with jobs, help us balance the budget, and launch the virtuous cycle that will let freed markets build our nation's wealth.

Here, I am pleased to report that we are reversing decades of mismanagement. We have just reached an agreement with IMF. But, most significantly, we are determined to create the wealth that will not make us dependent.

During this decade, we can assure you that we will be able to pay both for our security and delivery of our services.

If economic growth is the first foundation block of self-reliance, the second foundation is with the education of Afghanistan's women.

No country in the modern world can be self-reliant with half of its population locked away, uneducated and unable to contribute its energy, creativity, and drive to national development.

We have a tradition of respecting women. And let us not forget the largest trader in Arabia was the wife of the Prophet. And the greater transmitter of knowledge—the authentic sayings of the Prophet—was his second wife.

Aberrant customs do not replace the fundamental sense of justice between men and women that societies that seek fairness are built upon.

Afghan culture traditionally had space for women as leaders, managers, and traders. The gender apartheid imposed by the Taliban came from people who had grown up outside of families, in refugee camps and religious boarding schools.

Our plan for restoring women's place in society is built of three pillars that rest on a foundation of respect for the human, religious, and constitutional rights of all of our citizens.

First—and I want to spend a little time on this theme—educating women is not solely a matter of rights, important though they are. It is a matter of national necessity.

I have said in the past that educating one Afghan young girl will change the

next five generations of a family. I would not be standing before you today as an educated man had my grandmother—in exile in India who had learned to read under the British—not taken it upon herself to make sure that I would match my youthful passion for hunting and riding horses with mastering the classics in Dari and Pashto and striving to excel in foreign languages.

Thank you, Grandmother.

Afghanistan's self-reliance demands men and women who can run a modern economy. Basic health and education must reach all Afghan girls. That is a promise. But beyond providing all Afghan girls with these basic rights, we will increase to parity the number of women graduating from high schools and colleges.

Even as I address you today, in Kabul designs are already being finished for an all-women's university that will provide safe, top-quality education for the next generation of Afghan women leaders.

Let me tell you the story of Khatera Afghan, a young woman from Kandahar. Her schooling began when she braved threats of disfigurement by people swearing that they would throw acid in her face before they would let a girl attend a school. She would not be dissuaded. Her uncle threatened to disown her when she applied to university. But she stared him down.

Khatera went to the American University of Afghanistan, where she not only topped her class but, aided by a Fulbright scholarship, went on to get a master's degree from the Ohio State University.

Today, Khatera's formerly angry uncle is so proud of her that he tells his grandchildren, both little boys and little girls, that they must be as brave as their Aunt Khatera.

Khatera, like thousands of Afghan women, thanks America for those opportunities—for the primary school teachers, for the university in Kabul, for the scholarship to Ohio—that changed her life and her children's future. And she is dedicated to create opportunities for millions of other Afghans.

The second pillar is that women must have the same access to economic opportunities as men. Women's full empowerment will come about, not through global conventions or government programs, but when they have jobs and own businesses.

The United States has been a steadfast supporter of the nationwide National Solidarity Program which, for 10 years, has given not thousands but millions of poor village women their first chance to control their own resources.

Our third and final foundational belief is that a mental and cultural revolution must take place over the treatment of women in and by our society. There is no point talking about how much we respect women's honor if we let rape go unpunished or allow harassment in our streets.

We have signed the global conventions to end violence and discrimination against women; we will implement them vigorously, but work is still needed to convince our people that the protection of women's rights is part and parcel of their own quest for social justice.

I, personally, as the leader of Afghanistan, am committed to working with the ulema, activists, and thought leaders of our country to bring about this mental change. Both the CEO, Dr. Abdullah, and I will insist that the officials of our government set the national standard for workplace fairness.

Thanks to your help and support, the opportunities for women are indeed changing. I am sure that many of you have seen those stunning Skateistan videos of fathers proudly taking their shiny-eyed daughters to show off their newfound skills in the ancient art of skateboarding. They are but the tip of the changes that are underway and which must be protected and advanced.

I am meeting, frequently, women who are entertaining the idea—seriously—the idea of becoming the first woman President of Afghanistan, and we will support them.

I am pleased to state that we have fulfilled our promise to name four women to the Afghan Cabinet, raising the women's share to 20 percent—still too low, but at least fulfillment of our promise.

We are determined to name qualified women as ambassadors and to increase their number as deputy ministers, and we are working hard to attract and train a whole new cadre of women technocrats into our government. I promise you that, 5 years from now, our ministries will have a whole new look to them, with women in leading positions.

We are a country of young people. The absolute majority of people are under 30 years of age. Youth are invested in the future, not in repeating the past. Jobs and engagement with the world are their first priority.

Despite all of the assistance that Afghanistan has received over the years, 30 percent of the population still lives below the poverty line, lacking even basic services such as clean water or household electricity. This cannot continue.

We have articulated a citizen's charter that will guide the investments that are needed to reduce poverty across the nation and prepare the next generation for capitalizing on the new opportunities that a thriving economy can provide.

Ladies and gentlemen, so far, I have talked about how we will achieve self-reliance by ending corruption, balancing the budget, mobilizing the energies of our women and youth, and growing the economy. Let me now turn to the elephant that is lurking in the back of the room.

We must secure peace.

Afghans have shown that we know how to fight. Unfortunately, we have inherited that skill for 3 million years.

Since as far back as the invasion of Alexander and the more modern expulsion of the Soviet Union, Afghans have shown that we will protect our country against foreign attack, no matter how steep the price or how well armed the intruder.

I have no doubt that, provided that they continue to receive equipment and training, our Armed Forces will stand firm against any efforts by outside extremists to build a base inside our territory; but we must now show that we can also bring peace.

Our strategy is built around three initiatives. The first is to use our diplomacy to build a community of nations that is committed to stability in Asia. Dr. Abdullah and I have met with the leaders of Pakistan, India, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, and China, among others. Their commitment for building mutual security across nations includes ending the financing and sanctuary for extremist groups.

The second initiative is to build up the ability of our Armed Forces to project the elected government across our entire national territory. Our partnership with the United States and ISAF, now transformed into the resolute support mission, has given Afghanistan a well-trained army that is bringing the fight to the enemy. We are no longer on the defensive, but have taken the offensive.

On December 31, 2014, all combat operations were handed over to Afghan National Security Forces. General John Campbell, the U.S. commander of the Resolute Support mission, has publicly testified in this very Chamber that the Afghan Army's professionalism and morale meet all of a military man's expectations.

Thanks to our army, we will negotiate with the Taliban from a position of strength, not weakness, so that the hard-fought gains in education, health, governance, media freedom, and women's rights are not lost.

The third initiative will be our push for national reconciliation. The Taliban need to choose not to be al Qaeda and be our friend; and, if they choose to be our friend, they will be welcome to be part of the fabric of our society.

Many believe themselves to be patriots rebelling against the corruption and criminality that they saw in their towns and villages. We can deal with legitimate grievances. Provided that combatants agree to respect the constitution and the rule of law as the outcomes of negotiations, we are confident that we can find a path for their return to society.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not here to tell you a story about an overnight transformation of my country. You are too wise for such stories. Twelve years of partnership provide evidence enough that the road ahead will be difficult.

We live in a rough neighborhood. We are a very poor country. Self-reliance

is our goal. We bear the scars of the fight against the Soviet Union and the forces of fundamentalism, scars that are as much in our minds as on the bodies of the Afghan farmers and American soldiers who have fought for freedom.

Although we may be poor, we are very proud. Our goal of self-reliance is no pipedream told to pacify partners who are tired of hearing the promises that we later fail to keep. We want your know-how, the business skills of your corporations, the innovation of your startups, and the commitment of your NGOs, but we don't want your charity.

We have no more interest in perpetuating a childish dependence than you have in being saddled with a poor family member who lacks the energy and drive to get out and find a job. We are not going to be the lazy Uncle Joe.

Afghanistan can and will be an enduring success. Your support, your understanding, and your commitment to our country will not have been in vain. Afghanistan will be the graveyard of al Qaeda and their foreign terrorist associates.

Never again will our country be a host to terrorists. Never again will we give extremists the sanctuary to plan their destructive plots. We are determined to become the Asian development roundabout and the platform for the peaceful cooperation of civilizations.

Together, our two countries will finish the job that began on that clear, terrible September morning almost 14 years ago. We have the will and we have the commitment that will anchor our country in the world community of peaceful, democratic nations.

Knowing our conditions, you—the American Congress—and the American people will decide how to ensure that our common goals and interests are written into the books that will be telling the history of our shared future.

Thank you again, and may God bless the partnership between America and Afghanistan.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1229

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 25, 2015 at 10:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 301.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 163 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. 27.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1230

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. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 24, 2015, general debate on the congressional budget had expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, under the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the Joint Economic Committee provides analysis and recommendations about the goals and policies set forth in the economic report of the President, and this is to assist the House in its consideration of the budget resolution.

During the next hour, the members of the Joint Economic Committee will answer two questions: Why has this economic recovery been so weak when compared with past recoveries? And secondly, how would a gradual reduction of Federal spending, relative to the size of America's economy, as envisioned in the House Republican budget resolution, how would this help hard-working Americans by accelerating economic growth, job creation, and real wage increases?

Regrettably, our economy remains stuck in second gear. Last year, real GDP—in other words, apples-to-apples economy—grew by a mere 2.37 percent. That is an imperceptible increase over the average annual growth rate of 2.33 percent during the entire recovery.

Although conditions have improved, the Obama recovery remains the weakest, or near the bottom, in terms of every major measurement of economic performance, compared with other recoveries over the past half century.

The Joint Economic Committee describes the difference in economic performance in this recovery and with the average of other recoveries since 1960 as the "growth gap"—and this growth gap is real.

Since the recession ended, the economy has grown by 13.5 percent, compared with the average growth of 24.1 percent during other recoveries. This growth gap means our economy is currently missing \$1.5 trillion, a hole comparable in size to the economy of Australia or Mexico or Spain.

Since the recession ended, private sector payrolls—that is, Main Street jobs—increased by 10 percent, but over the average of other recoveries, it was more than 15 percent. Thus, from the end of the recession, the growth gap in Main Street jobs is a staggering 5.5 million jobs. America is missing 5.5 million jobs, enough to hire everyone looking for work in 45 States.

Not surprisingly, hard-working American families have felt the adverse effects of slow growth and lagging job creation in their pocketbook. Since the recession ended, real after-tax income per person has increased by

a total of merely 7 percent—7.1 percent, to be exact. In other recoveries, it was over 15 percent. Thus, the growth gap in real after-tax income equates to nearly \$3,000 per person. It is \$2,915. So what that means for a family of four in America is that they are missing \$11,000 a year from their family budget.

Ironically, for a President that obsesses about income inequality and promotes "middle class economics," the White House has presided over a disappointing recovery that has bestowed most of its benefits to the wealthy and the well-connected. While families and businesses on Main Street continue to suffer from a very disappointing recovery, the S&P Total Return Index, adjusted for inflation—meaning Wall Street—has increased by 125.4 percent since the end of the recession. So Wall Street is roaring; Main Street and hard-working taxpayers are suffering.

Closing the growth gap in the economy and jobs and paychecks will be very hard for this President to achieve with his current slow-growth policies.

While the economy has improved month after month, in truth, it has gone so slow. It is like bragging that your car has run for 63 straight months, but it only is running at 5 miles an hour. Well, that is what our economy is doing. And to catch up from these slow-growth policies, we need to break even with the average performance of other recoveries. By the time President Obama leaves the White House:

Our economy will have to grow at an annual rate of 7.4 percent in each of the next eight quarters. This is triple the growth rate in the Obama recovery.

Private sector jobs—Main Street jobs, in effect—would have to generate 403,000 jobs every month for the next 22 months. So this is well above the average of the disappointing Obama recovery of 285,000 jobs, especially in the last 6 months.

Real after-tax income for every person in America—that is, what their real disposable income is—would have to grow at an annual rate of 6.3 percent through the rest of President Obama's term. This is more than four times faster than what it has been doing during the Obama recovery.

So why has our economy been so weak? Why has the Obama recovery been nearly dead last in all of these areas?

First, Federal spending is out of control.

Albert Einstein defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again yet expecting different results. Is this not the perfect description of President Obama's budget? His budget reflects his dogmatic commitment to failed Keynesian economic policies—notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence that we are mired in the worst economic recovery of the last 50 years, creating this large and persistent growth gap. From the failed stimulus through ObamaCare to demands for

more Federal infrastructure projects, President Obama's thirst for new spending has never slackened.

Like a basketball team that cannot make halftime adjustments, this President refuses to learn from his failures. His budget would increase Federal spending next year by another \$74 billion and by another \$300-plus billion over the next 5 years. This, as this President is taking more in tax dollars from every American than almost at any time in history.

We don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. If you look at this chart, you can see where per person revenue in America through the Federal Government nearly the highest it has been, frankly, in the last 30 to 40 years. Fortunately, a Republican House has successfully applied the brakes to this spending, preventing a far worse economic mess.

Second, our tax system is broken.

For businesses, America has the highest corporate income tax rate among developed countries. And we are the only one in our global competitors with a system that taxes you here, taxes you abroad, and punishes you if you bring your profits back to invest in America. This puts American companies and the workers at a huge disadvantage with foreign competitors.

For individuals here in America, our income tax system is so complex that 90 percent of taxpayers need to use a paid preparer or tax software, and families can't possibly keep up with the 4,000 changes in the tax law that occurred over the last decade. That is one new tax change every day of the year.

And third, President Obama has greatly expanded the regulatory burden—red tape—on American businesses and families during and after a severe recession. For example, the Affordable Care Act has imposed enormous new burdens on America's families, on our local businesses and health care providers.

Mr. Chairman, 4.5 years after enactment of financial regulations, regulators still haven't completed writing more than 40 percent of the new rules required under the Dodd-Frank Act; meanwhile, our local bankers and local businesses have not been able to finance growth in their communities as a result of these regulations.

President Obama has slow-walked the development of oil and natural gas on Federal lands and waters and stubbornly vetoed the job-creating Keystone XL pipeline.

Most recently, President Obama's Federal Communications Commission went back in time and imposed a 1930s-style regulation designed to control the telephone monopoly and now applied to the highly competitive Internet.

Fourth, President Obama greatly expanded social welfare benefits during and after the severe recession. During the 1960s, Democratic Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson knew that America's economy needed to be

strong in order to afford the Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamp programs they favored. Both Presidents insisted that Congress enact an investment tax credit, an across-the-board reduction in income tax rates, to put our economy into high gear before enacting new entitlement programs.

Instead, President Obama did the opposite. He rammed ObamaCare through in a divided and controversial late-night maneuver, rammed through a large expansion of food stamps, extended unemployment benefits through a Democrat-controlled Congress before our economy had fully recovered. His entitlement expansions reduced the labor force participation. In other words, it has held back those who want to be in the workforce.

According to University of Chicago economist Casey Mulligan, ObamaCare alone will, by 2017, cause roughly a 3 percent reduction in weekly employment, 3 percent fewer total hours worked, and a 2 percent reduction in labor income—so less jobs, less hours worked, less in your paycheck.

Taken together, President Obama's economic policies have increased the cost of doing business now and heightened uncertainty about their future. This is the opposite of what economically successful Presidents such as John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan did.

The Republican budget recognizes the Obama recovery is disappointing for Republicans, for Democrats, for Independents, for college graduates, for middle class, hard-working Americans. The Republican budget, which is a balanced budget for a stronger America, will give us a healthier economy.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle claimed that this recovery is weaker than "average" ones. However, economic research reveals that this is terribly misleading because financial crises like the one that caused the Great Recession have deeper, more damaging, and longer lasting effects. In addition, the Great Recession was caused by a bursting of a housing bubble, limiting housing's ability to contribute to recovery as it typically had after previous recessions.

The recovery from the Great Recession is also different because monetary policy's ability to support the economy was limited by hitting the zero lower bound—interest rates simply could not go any lower.

There have been a number of economic downturns since the founding of our Nation—some mild, some deep and strong.

Last week, at a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee with Chairman Jason Furman of the Council of Economic Advisers, I asked him how would he characterize the 2008 financial meltdown under former President George

W. Bush. I asked him: How does the 2008 Bush recession rate?

He said that the economic blows in this recession were five times greater than the Great Recession. And he also said, when I asked him to put it into laymen's terms—was it a common cold? pneumonia? a heart attack? the flu?—he said that the Bush recession was especially deep and damaging, the worst since the Great Depression.

And I asked him: Was it a common cold?

He said: No. It was a heart attack.

The reality is that when you compare our record to other countries that are recovering from the Great Recession, you can see in this chart that the United States economy has expanded at a significantly faster rate than other leading, advanced economies in the world. So when he says we are slow, we are certainly a lot faster than the rest of the world.

Look at this. Here is the United States. Here is the European Union. Here is Japan. Here is the United Kingdom. The United States has recovered stronger and faster than the other world economies.

So when my colleagues across the aisle say that the Obama recovery pales in comparison to average ones, just remember that the comparison is an absolutely ridiculous one.

The recession was an economic heart attack, a financial calamity, and we should thank President Obama that we are now recovering, and recovering faster than like economies in the world.

A budget is about planning for the future. That planning must be based on reality and must be grounded in our recent experience. The Republican budget is a misleading, dishonest budget which relies on accounting gimmicks and \$1 trillion in unspecified cuts.

□ 1245

It rejects lessons we should have already learned. In 2008 and 2009, this country faced the greatest economic downturn since the Great Depression. The shocks that hit the U.S. economy in the fall of 2008 were at least as large as those that caused the Great Depression. The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Jason Furman, told the Joint Economic Committee last week that during the Great Recession, household wealth fell by at least five times the decline seen in 1929. More than \$16 trillion in wealth evaporated in American families, causing great pain and suffering.

Today, some 6½ years later, the economy is a very different place. The U.S. economy has expanded at a faster pace than nearly all other advanced economies. The GDP has grown in 20 of the past 22 quarters, and we have had a record—a record—60 straight months of private sector job growth. This didn't just happen. It happened because of the unprecedented response from the Federal Reserve and the bold actions taken by the Democratic Congress and President Obama.

The Recovery Act stimulated growth and invested in our future, investing in infrastructure, education, research, and job training. Those are things we don't see in the Republican budget. We don't see those investments.

The Recovery Act cut taxes for middle class families, increased tax credits for the working poor, and directed Federal funds to States and cities so that they could keep police officers on the beat, firemen on the job, and teachers in the classroom. It invested \$50 billion in transportation infrastructure. We don't see any of that in the Republican budget. We don't even see cutting tax loopholes for special interests. We don't see any of that. We just see cutting tax support for the middle class and the working Americans.

Other actions taken by Congress included extensions of unemployment insurance and COBRA subsidies, a payroll tax credit for hiring unemployed workers, a payroll tax cut for all workers, and help for small businesses. It stopped an economic disaster and got our economy moving again.

Mr. Chairman, this chart shows this. Numbers do not lie. The deep, dark red valley covered Republican policies that are in this budget. When President Obama came to office, we slowly worked our way up and have continued to add millions of jobs for working Americans. Today, the unemployment rate is 5.5 percent, its lowest level in almost 7 years. We have had 12 straight months of private sector job gains exceeding 200,000 jobs, something that has not happened since 1977. The auto industry is thriving. Remember the Republicans wanted to abolish the auto industry? But we invested in restructuring, and 5 years later the industry has added more than 500,000 jobs, and we are exporting American cars at the highest level.

The economy is strong and getting stronger. Now is the time to build on this progress. Now is the time to ensure that the economic recovery reaches every American. Now is the time to invest in our future by funding infrastructure, education, workforce training, and scientific research. But that is not what the Republican budget does. The Republican budget slashes spending on things that would help continue our forward blue high rise of creating more jobs, and it uses a slush fund and unspecified cuts to make it appear that it all adds up.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget offered would get us off the path—this beautiful path of success—taking us back in the direction of the Bush recession. It represents an abrupt U-turn, one that we cannot afford. It would risk the recent economic progress and harm working families struggling to get ahead.

So let's support the Democratic budget and the progress that we are making in creating jobs and improving the quality of life of Americans and the security of our country. Let's not turn around to the old, tired Republican

policies that gave us that dark, deep recession and that red, dark valley.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out this was a serious recession. It was not the most serious and severe since the Great Depression. The recession in 1981 and the November of 1982 recession reached a higher unemployment rate, 10.8 percent greater than this recession. And that was settled, frankly, when interest rates reached over 20 percent.

The truth is there have been jobs added for 60 straight months. You ought to take that graph and double it in job growth, there you would get just the average economic recovery. We continue to struggle as a country, and we shouldn't settle for this second-rate economic recovery.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a new member of the Joint Economic Committee. He is someone who has had longstanding experience in Arizona managing money, understanding State finances, and handling the numbers that our economy, frankly, is based on.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. For my friend from Texas, thank you. It is actually a joy being on this committee. It is fascinating the access to data. It is also fascinating how the data sort of gets, as you have already heard here in the first few minutes, sort of politicized by some of us almost to the edge of fantasy.

Remember, if we step back to 2011, if we look at the President's own economic graphs, we were going to see economic GDP expansion approaching 5 percent of GDP. The indicators we were just getting this last week, it is this coming quarter, the quarter we are in right now, we may be about to see GDP of about 1.2 percent.

At some point, holding up a board, it says look at the jobs, and then looking at the actual math, reality should hit home.

Here is the President's own economic report. If you start to look at the numbers in here, if someone will actually break it open and actually read it, look at the numbers in here of workforce participation, how many of our brothers and sisters out there in the workforce are actually in the job market? There is something horribly, horribly wrong out there.

So why do the Republicans so focus, so fixate on economic growth? It is the reality of what is about to happen in this country. In 4½ years—so right now we are discussing a \$3.8 trillion budget. In 4½ years, we are expecting \$1 trillion more in spending. Where is that growth? Where is that money coming from?

Look at this slide. We are going to try to put up some slides that just show you how quickly mandatory spending is consuming everything in its path, and if we do not have a phe-

nominal economic growth, we are not going to be able to keep our promises.

For right now, here is where we are today. We are basically, right now, only 31 percent of the budget we ultimately get to vote on. The vast majority of our budget is in what we call mandatory spending: Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new ObamaCare health care law.

Well, what happens over just the next 4½ years? How quickly does this mandatory spending begin to consume everything else in its path? Well, think about this. Just a couple years ago in the 2013 budget, we were projecting that it was going to take all the way out to the end of 2023 before we hit this split where only 24 percent were things we get to vote on and 76 percent—76 percent—of the spending was going to be Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new health care law.

Well, guess what is happening because of the Democrats' policy on economic growth, this President's policy on economic growth. So how quickly do we now hit where 76 percent of our money is going into mandatory? It is not 2023. It is in 4½ years.

Now, yes, when we track what is happening, particularly in Medicare and Medicaid spending, it is tracking faster than we expected. And, yes, we have had discipline in this body on dealing with what we are allowed to have discipline on because of the relationships having a split Congress and being disciplined in discretionary spending.

But understand, if we do not do those things that are necessary to dramatically grow this economy—and it is more than just talking about fantasies within this economic profile. It is regulatory, it is tax systems, and it is trade. And yet simple things—and this one is rather personal to me, and the ranking member was actually somewhat helpful on this—things like crowdfunding, little things that are simple, disappear in the bureaucracy for years after we even have bipartisan legislation.

What is it with this White House, with the Democrat Party's fear of those things that create economic expansion? Why does it always have to be some sort of massive, collectivist dogma to drive economic growth instead of letting the markets go? Understand, this is important because we are trying to help sell the story of why do we care so much about this economic growth. When you look at what is about to happen in net interest, look at how fast this grows.

I am going to actually move to the next slide just so you have a comparison. I want you to think about this. In just a few years, Mr. Chairman, the interest—and this is using nominal interest rates. If we have a spike, then it gets really bad really fast. But in just a few years, we are going to be spending as much money in this body on interest as we do for all of defense.

Well, at that point, if you care about the entitlements, if that is where you are ideologically, you care about protecting the country, you care about medical research, you care about these things, then the economic growth is everything. We can't grow ourselves out of this debt and deficit, but we can sure do some great good.

I beg my brothers on both sides of the aisle and my sisters, too, you need to step away a bit from some of the crazy dogma, pull back on some of the crazy regulations, the arrogance of thinking Washington knows everything, and let America begin to grow, allow it to begin to prosper. That is what the Republican budget is doing. It is dealing with the reality of the math we have been given by this President's policies and trying to drive it to a progrowth future with lots of options.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in response to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, numbers don't lie. These numbers were compiled by the bipartisan Bureau of Labor Statistics and updated in early March. It clearly shows that our economy was shedding 800,000 jobs a month before President Obama took office. And then because of his policies, it has continued to grow. Mr. Chairman, 12 million private sector jobs were added in the past 60 months—the longest of streak on record of job growth—and 288,000 private sector jobs added in February.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), an outstanding member of our committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me time to talk about my colleagues', the Republicans', budget, which is something I oppose.

I oppose it for a number of policy reasons, but I thought I would spend my time today talking about what I view is a more fundamental, analytical flaw in the budget, and that relates to the overall goal of the budget. Because if you have the wrong goal, you often make a series of bad decisions to support that goal. So I think it is important that we talk about what the goal of the budget is and what the goal of the budget should be.

The goal of the Republican budget is to have zero deficits within 10 years. In my opinion, that is the goal because it sounds good. We have all heard the line that we should not spend more money than we take in.

□ 1300

That sounds really good, but it ignores to many extents the basic math of budgets.

It is also an unrealistic goal, and it is also an unnecessary goal. And as a result of pursuing an unrealistic and unnecessary goal, a series of very bad decisions are embedded in the budget, which is why I want to talk about the goal.

It is an unrealistic goal when you look at the condition of the Federal budget at this moment in time. After several decades of this Congress and several administrations ignoring, in many ways, the fiscal responsibility of this great country and allowing our debt to become such a high percentage of our economy, we put ourselves in a position where we have had very significant deficits and the debt levels are such that we have very limited financial flexibility as a country, and if interest rates were to go up, it would increasingly consume a very large percentage of our budget. That is the problem and that is the situation we find ourselves in.

In addition, Mr. Chair, we are entering a phase where the demographic trends in the country and the aging on a relative basis of the population are putting tremendous pressure on the resources of the Federal Government.

So this is a very, very challenging time to take a budget that has had very significant deficits and try to bring them to zero within 10 years. That is why it is unrealistic.

It is also unnecessary because the most important metric in the financial health of the United States of America is our debt as a percentage of our economy.

If we want to lower our debt as a percentage of our economy, what we have to do is have a budget where our deficits, expressed as a percentage of our economy, are consistently lower than economic growth. So we should be targeting deficits of 1 to 2 percent with a view that the minimum baseline economic growth of this country will be 2 to 3 percent, and definitionally over time that will take the debt of the country as a percentage of the country down. It will give us more financial flexibility in the future and position us so that when interest rates rise, which they will, it will consume a much smaller percentage of our budget. That should be the goal.

But because we have this unrealistic and unnecessary goal of getting deficits to zero within 10 years, my Republican colleagues are forced to overcorrect in the budget to achieve that goal.

There are two fundamental ways to overcorrect in a budget. You either raise taxes very high to get revenues to get it to zero, or you cut investments very significantly.

Now, my Republican colleagues don't choose to raise taxes. In fact, what they choose to do is to cut taxes, which makes an already unrealistic goal more unrealistic. So the only thing that is left, the only thing that is left to bring this budget to zero within 10 years is massive, massive reductions in the investments we are making in our future and in our Nation, which, to me, is a very odd decision in light of the facts that are in front of us, and the facts that are in front of us are very clear. We are in a global and very competitive economy, and we haven't made the investments, particularly in things

like infrastructure, to position this country to compete as successfully as it should in a world that is increasingly interconnected.

Also, we have to make investments in our children, Mr. Chair. We are in a knowledge-based economy. And to make sure that our kids are capable of being employed and having a rising standard of living across their lives, we have to invest in their future.

So to achieve this unrealistic goal, my Republican colleagues make very significant, very, very significant cuts to these critical investments, which you could argue it has never been more important to do that. In fact, they bring many of these levels down to half of what they have been historically—again, and importantly, expressed as a percentage of our economy because it is irrelevant to talk about absolute numbers. The only numbers that should be talked about is the budget in terms of a percentage of our economy.

That is why I view this budget as so troubling and misguided. Mr. Chair, I spent my whole career prior to coming to Congress running publicly traded companies that I started. I used to observe other managers who are running publicly traded companies from time to time make really bad decisions about what to do with their business. Those bad decisions were often based on a fundamental premise that they would pander to the market and put forth unrealistic expectations. They would make bad decisions to achieve those expectations, and the story would end badly.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. DELANEY. That is what we have here. We have unrealistic expectations, a series of bad decisions, and, if this were to be followed, a bad outcome.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The message we hear today from my Democrat friends is the economy is great. This is really historical. We are adding just millions of new jobs. But that is not the real story. That is not the real economy.

The truth is millions of Americans have become so discouraged they have just dropped out of looking for work. Four out of 10 college graduates, they can't find a job, or they can't find a job that needs a college degree, so they are working behind a cash register.

We have got the fewest number of adults percentage-wise in the workforce today since the recovery began. So we have actually, since things are supposed to be so great, fewer adults than ever since that period. We are about flat. In some cases, we have gone backwards.

And the unemployment rate, while it is lowered to 5.5 percent in real terms, if our number of workers had stayed in the workforce, the true rate is closer to 9.7 percent.

If we want to stay with this second-rate disappointing recovery, stay the course. But if we want a stronger, healthier economy, we need to change direction. The Republican budget under Chairman TOM PRICE changes the trajectory and the momentum of America's economy, balancing it without raising taxes. The Federal Reserve said one of the drags on our economy are the tax increases from President Obama's fiscal cliff. We have so much more work to do to help our families, young people, and those looking for a job, we can't settle for second rate.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Republican budget looks like a blueprint, but it is not. It is more like a vague set of directions, with the most important pieces missing.

This budget calls for vast cuts, but it doesn't specify what will be cut or who will suffer the pain. It claims to lower budget deficits, but it relies on accounting gimmickry.

This document is not a blueprint. It is not an engineering marvel. It does not deserve our praise or even serious attention. It is fundamentally dishonest. It is a dishonest document that would hurt millions of Americans and imperil our future.

The deceptions in this document have already been brought to light by some of our Nation's leading papers. At this point, the fact that this budget is misleading doesn't surprise us, but the scope of the deception is absolutely breathtaking.

Before we go to the great leader from the great State of North Carolina, I would like to point out who gets hurt in this budget.

The Republican budget is also deceptive because it hides the fact that the "savings" they talk about, it achieves these savings at a huge cost to working families. Their budget is balanced on the backs of working Americans.

This budget slashes our investment in education. It devastates our investment in research and innovation. It ignores the problems of our crumbling infrastructure. It provides no solution to the looming bankruptcy of the Federal transportation fund, and it will destroy up to 2.9 million jobs in 2017 alone.

This is not general belt-tightening. It is the wholesale strangling of the dreams and opportunities of those who are already struggling.

It could fairly be called a plan to "soak the poor," because the poor and working Americans would be hit especially hard by this budget proposal, which would allow critical provisions of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit to expire at the end of 2017. Democratic programs to help working Americans would expire under their plan.

And that would increase the number of people in poverty by an estimated 1.8 million, including 1 million children.

This budget falsely claims that it will, in the Republican words, "make sure that those who need assistance get more than an invitation into a broken system."

It then proceeds to cut the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by \$125 billion between 2021 and 2025. This would either mean the end of food assistance for millions of low-income families or a cut in benefits below the less than \$1.50 per person per meal households now receive.

This budget would then further convert Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program into a block grant and drastically reduce its funding. This is not a budget for the future. It destroys the dreams of working Americans for the future.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a new member of our committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I stand in opposition to this blatantly dishonest Republican budget.

Republicans call this A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, but I call it Robin Hood in reverse.

Republicans say that it will bring greater opportunity and a healthier economy for the working class, but I say it widens the gap between the haves and the have-nots.

Our economy is driven by middle class American families.

This budget attacks them, and it attacks our economy. It is a one-sided partisan plan, increasing savings for the rich by \$200,000, increasing taxes for the average American by \$2,000. It repeals the Affordable Care Act, which has insured 16 million more people previously uninsured.

The district in North Carolina I represent benefits from the Democratic alternative budget. It is negatively impacted by this Republican budget.

My district has an unemployment rate more than double the State and the national average, and more than 27 percent of people in my district live below the poverty line. That is 12 percent more, Mr. Chair, than the national average.

Cuts to SNAP funding in this budget impact more than 1.5 million North Carolinians and more than 65,000 people in our 12th District. I cannot support a budget that hurts my constituents. We need a budget that brings jobs back to the 12th District and to the millions of Americans across this Nation who work hard every day to feed their families.

This budget launches a strong attack on education. As a former professor and member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I am troubled by the fact that this budget slashes \$1.2 billion in education funding for our country, cutting more than \$36 million in education funding for North Carolinians. 790 children under 5 in North Carolina would be left out of critical

Head Start programs. Pell grants would be frozen for students. When our children fail, everyone fails.

The Democratic alternative budget is what we need because it supports hard-working middle class families, it contributes to job growth, it invests in our children's education, and it supports our most vital programs.

I ask my colleagues on the other side to join me and countless other Members in supporting a sensible Democratic alternative. Let's continue the blue rise that our President made possible.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, the budget deceptively claims to adhere to the budget caps that are otherwise known as the sequestration levels of 2016, yet it adds tens of billions of dollars to what Republicans themselves have called a "slush fund" for defense, including lucrative military contracts.

The budget dishonestly calls for another \$1.1 trillion in cuts to "mandatory" programs somewhere, somehow without specifying what those cuts would be, who they would hit, or how it would all happen.

And it does not balance the budget. The budget falsely claims that it will place the country on a path of prosperity and paying off the debt when, in fact, it will not. As the Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman has pointed out: If this budget were to become law, as written, it would actually leave the Federal Government several trillion dollars deeper in debt than claimed.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my good friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chair, today, we will be asked to vote on a budget resolution that should outline our priorities and our values as a nation.

But this year, House Republicans have proposed what I refer to as a "magic budget" that goes far beyond the sleights of hand and fiscal gimmicks that folks have grown accustomed to seeing here in Washington.

□ 1315

Republicans would like us to believe that their painful spending cuts will balance the budget in just 9 years. Unfortunately, the basic immutable laws of accounting contradict this claim. The Republican budget claims to save \$5.5 trillion and balance the budget in just 9 years. Allow me to explain this magic budget.

The magic budget extends tax cuts for corporations and eliminates the alternative minimum tax, but it doesn't

account for the \$150 billion in lost revenue. This is where it gets even trickier. The Republican budget then cuts \$1.1 trillion in spending without any indication of where it would come from.

It then takes a sharp turn to the right and repeals ObamaCare, but it still, amazingly, uses the \$1 trillion in future revenue from ObamaCare to balance the budget by 2024.

Mr. Chairman, this is one magic budget. America deserves better.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The one thing that economist Paul Krugman is expert at is being wrong. Had we followed his prescription, this economy would be even slower than it is, and our Nation would be deeper in debt.

Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. The latest numbers, as of January of this year, show the amount of revenue the Federal Government has been taking in from each and every American is at nearly record highs.

The Republican budget strengthens the economy, tackles the spending problem, and changes the course of this disappointing recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to my good friend on the other side of the aisle.

Economist Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize winner, did not support the Republican policies that led to the red, deep valley when we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. He supported many of the proposals that President Obama and the Democrats implemented, which led to growth and more jobs.

The President and the Democrats will not be satisfied until every American who wants a job has a job; yet numbers don't lie, and this chart, which is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' numbers, shows policies that led to 800,000 jobs lost per month to, now, an economy that is growing.

I admit that Democrats will not be happy until it grows even more, but 12 million private sector jobs have been added. I want to go back to a budget that, I believe, will turn this blue into the red again. We have to continue with the blue policies that led to economic opportunities and job growth.

Now, the Republican budget document claims that it aims to make sure that government keeps the promises that it has made, and then it proceeds to lay out plans to demolish Medicare. Medicare is one of the most successful and universally popular programs ever designed.

It provides high-quality health care for Americans over the age of 65; yet this Republican budget would replace this program with a voucher program, giving seniors a coupon to help defray the cost of private insurance. Seniors would have to immediately pay new copays for preventative care and much higher costs for prescription drugs.

They don't say how they are going to help the seniors. They are just going to give them this voucher program. Can private insurance companies provide better coverage? They don't know. They don't say anything about it. They just give them vouchers and let them go to private insurance.

They don't say whether their program will cost more in out-of-pocket expenses, but I think it definitely will. Dismantling health care is a radical proposition. My guess is that, if Congress tries to take apart Medicare, millions of Americans will storm Capitol Hill.

Let's remember what happened in the early 2000s when then-President George W. Bush tried to partially privatize Social Security. Like Medicare, Social Security is extremely popular with seniors because it works, and it makes a huge, positive difference in their lives.

For many older Americans, Social Security is the only source of retirement income they will have, and for others, it is a critical supplement to their savings. Republicans have previously tried to privatize it.

Let's be honest with the American people. If my Republican colleagues want to dismantle Medicare, they should come right out and say it and say it loudly.

In their budget proposal, our friends across the aisle complain about how long it has taken our economy to recover from the Great Recession. Remember that it bubbled up and blew up on their watch. The recession was on their watch with their proposals.

Their budget talks a great deal about accountability; yet nowhere do our Republican colleagues indicate that they should be held accountable for the mistakes and the mismanagement that led to the Great Recession. To the \$17 trillion in household wealth that was lost, thankfully, most of that household wealth has been regained, and that is thanks to the Obama recovery.

For my Republican friends who want to brush away any mention of the failed Republican policies of the past that brought us to the verge of economic collapse, I would remind you of the prophesy—of the words—of a great philosopher who said: Those who do not know the past are condemned to repeat it.

I do not want to go back to the past of the red, deep valley that this chart shows. Republicans' promises in the past of prosperity through austerity have proven to be hollow. Democratic policies have produced an economy that has just added more than 200 private sector jobs every month for 12 straight months. That is the first time that has happened since 1977.

Republicans' predictions that the passage of the Recovery Act would produce economic doom, hyperinflation, and the collapse of the dollar were all proven wrong. Democratic policies have produced an economy that has been growing steadily, with

low inflation, a strong dollar, cheap gas, a deficit that has shrunk by two-thirds, and a Dow Jones index that has tripled.

Republicans lamented that the passage of the Affordable Care Act would make health care unaffordable. It turned out to be totally untrue. The annual increase in healthcare premiums has dropped to a 50-year low.

Now, I would like to take a short detour to give some advice for home buyers. If you ever consider buying a new house that is built on a blueprint like this Republican budget blueprint, please do not do it. Save your money. Look for a home that is built on a solid foundation. Look for a house that has strong walls and a solid roof. Look for one that will protect your family for a long time. Don't buy a house built on a blueprint that is as shoddy as this one.

They are going back to their same failed policy. This budget is a fiasco, and the numbers do not add up. I am pleased that even some of my Republican colleagues have had the courage to say so. Some have called it budgetary tricks, gimmicks, funny money, slush funds; but the truth is far worse than that.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Chair say that all time has expired on the Democrat side of the aisle?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Look, I don't blame Democrats for not understanding this budget. They could never pass one. In fact, there hasn't been a budget for this great country since 2009, when they were in charge. In fact, it is the Republicans who have consistently in the House passed a budget only to have a Democrat Senate do nothing.

Now, for the first time, the American public has said: we have had enough of this, enough of the deficits, enough of this struggling economy, enough of this out-of-control spending; we want a real budget.

This step takes place today with Chairman PRICE's balanced budget for a stronger economy. I would point out that the American public knows exactly the Democratic policies that have brought them the weakest recovery in 50 years, and it is why, 5 years after the recovery began, most Americans still think they are in a recession. They think their families and their communities are still in a recession. We are not going to settle for this second-rate economy.

I would point out, while I am pleased there has been some job creation over the last 60 months, compare it to the average. If this were just a C-grade recovery—just the middle of the pack, nothing to brag about—we would be creating 403,000 new jobs every month,

not 200,000-plus. It would be almost double that. If you look at the Reagan recovery, which had higher unemployment, there were 750,000 jobs more a month.

That chart does show positive growth, but it is so weak and so disappointing, and it is accompanied by stagnant paychecks and college graduates who are working behind cash registers. If we want to stick with that, no problem, we know exactly what to do; but if we want to change course as a country, if we want to stop growing Washington's economy and grow our local economies, we are going to have to change course.

The weakness of this recovery can be captured in three numbers. We are missing \$1.5 trillion out of today's economy, and people are suffering. We are missing 5.5 million jobs, which is enough to put everyone looking for work in 45 States back to work, and we are missing \$11,000 a year out of a family of four's family budget.

Can you imagine what \$11,000 could do in paying for tuition and fuel and college costs? This growth gap will persist unless we change course.

Firstly, the budget resolution gradually addresses these issues by gradually bringing Federal spending back into line, allowing Washington to balance the budget and grow the economy.

Secondly, the budget resolution builds on the success of the welfare reform of the 1990s when Democrat President Bill Clinton and a Republican Congress worked together to give block grants to the States so they could develop programs to help able-bodied, working poor people find jobs, and it succeeded.

In employing this successful model, the budget resolution envisions converting Medicaid and food stamp programs into block grants that would allow States to tailor these programs to the needs of their States, to experiment and to find more innovative ways to get people out of work and into a career and a lifetime that they have envisioned.

Thirdly, the budget envisions the repeal of the unpopular and unworkable monstrosity known as ObamaCare.

Fourthly, the budget resolution envisions saving Medicare once and for all, putting in place the reforms that would actually keep this important program for seniors and for generations to come.

Finally, the budget resolution envisions progrowth tax reform—built for growth—to get America back to work and American companies competing and winning around the world.

There is so much more we must do in reforming the Tax Code and balancing regulation and creating a sound dollar and creating sales agreements around the world so our companies can compete, but we can't do that until this government has a budget that is built for America's growth, not for the government's growth.

I strongly commend the work of Chairman PRICE and of the other Re-

publican members of the Budget Committee. I urge the House to vote for this budget resolution. We need to change course in this country so we can get hard-working taxpayers, young people, and families back to work and living the American Dream.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, Section 804 of H. Con. Res. 27 contains the budget resolution's policy statement on tax reform. These policy goals are familiar, as we have been pursuing them for several years now. They include simplifying the tax code for families and businesses, reducing tax rates and consolidating the existing seven brackets into just two, repealing the burdensome Alternative Minimum Tax, reducing what is currently the highest corporate rate in the developed world, and transitioning to a more competitive system of international taxation.

With respect to this last goal, the budget resolution includes language that did not appear in previous budget resolutions. Section 804(b)(5) specifies that our international tax system should be reformed "in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry." Because this language is new, I would like to explain in more detail how it should be interpreted.

Nondiscrimination is a key principle of tax reform. The tax code should not pick winners or losers. All businesses should be on a level playing field, so that the free market decides where to allocate capital based on the most promising economic opportunities, not based on where one can obtain the most tax breaks. At the same time, when some taxpayers use sophisticated tax planning to exploit loopholes in the tax code to achieve a result much more favorable than other taxpayers can achieve, the nondiscrimination principle is violated and capital flows to the least taxed investments rather than to the most economically productive investments, leading to economic distortions and lower growth. For this reason, the committee report on H. Con. Res. 27, House Report 114-47, clarifies that, "This nondiscrimination principle, however, is not intended to prevent the adoption of reasonable anti-avoidance rules."

As an example, under the current tax code a U.S. company that keeps its intellectual property (IP) in the United States and licenses it to foreign customers must pay a corporate tax rate of 35 percent on royalties related to that IP. But a competitor that moves its IP from the United States to a foreign subsidiary in Bermuda and then licenses it to foreign customers pays zero on its royalties. That means our tax code discriminates against U.S.-owned IP and in favor of foreign-owned IP, which is why so much of our valuable intellectual property has left the country. On the other hand, a tax reform proposal that says both companies pay the same low tax rate on those royalties—for instance, a rate similar to Ireland's rate, which is where so many U.S. companies are moving to lower their tax burden—would end this discrimination and therefore would be consistent with section 804(b)(5). And by ending this discrimination with the same low tax rate for both companies, the proposal would encourage not only intellectual property to return to the United States, but also the R&D and manufacturing jobs associated with it.

I hope this clarifies how section 804(b)(5) should be interpreted, and I look forward to

working with Chairman PRICE and the rest of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, as we continue working to enact tax reform legislation in the 114th Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies has 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. 27

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.

Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.

Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.

Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.

Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.

Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.

Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.

Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.

Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.

Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.

Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.

Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

- Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
- Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.
- Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.
- Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.
- Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

- Sec. 601. Direct spending.

TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

- Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.

TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

- Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.
- Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.
- Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.
- Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.
- Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 819. Policy statement on "No Budget, No Pay".
- Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

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

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.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,934,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,873,969,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,109,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,327,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,462,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,272,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,009,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,893,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,131,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,907,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,463,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,911,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,398,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,320,000,000.

(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 2016: -\$342,278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$130,555,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$68,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$87,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,079,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$56,944,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$52,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$183,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$220,418,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,047,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,393,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,641,396,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,947,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,261,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,505,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$20,906,471,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$21,075,678,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$20,916,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$20,904,522,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,838,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,040,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,145,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$14,338,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,560,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,742,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$15,128,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$15,300,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$15,162,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$15,235,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$366,527,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$366,527,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$414,768,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$414,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$477,731,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,731,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$531,032,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$531,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$578,654,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$578,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$612,121,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$612,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$642,388,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$642,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$667,089,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$667,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$684,301,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$684,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$695,929,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$695,929,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority -\$33,462,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.

(20) Government-wide savings (930):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$27,465,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,929,000,000.
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$73,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-
 al War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$94,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,758,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$21,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

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

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

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

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(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 enforcing 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 discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

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. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), 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.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget

Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and 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.

(b) **FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN 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 budgetary effects 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 budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, 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 effect.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), 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. 407. 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 in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.**—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) 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 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, 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. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending

(budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.

(a) **CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.**—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(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 budgetary 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 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) 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.

SEC. 411. 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 V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

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

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary 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 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 507. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 508. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit re-

forms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure is related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism by the amounts provided in such legislation in excess of \$73.5 billion but not to exceed \$94 billion, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 601. 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 2016 is 6.8 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 2016 is 4.6 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 assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on 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.

(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 2016 is 5.4 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 2016 is 5.5 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. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with 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. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(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 VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

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

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) DEBT.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

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

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its “power of the purse”, and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way. consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to “pay for” merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and “reforms” enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget

that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress’s “power of the purse”, and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(9) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(10) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(11) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

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

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country’s fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual’s job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country’s economic outlook. 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. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country’s standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a “crowding out” of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country’s standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(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 will 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 helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 804. 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 United States 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) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. 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 highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

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

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(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 can reach nearly 45 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 slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. 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 United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States 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 about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their retirement and their children's education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

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

(17) 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. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform 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 and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

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

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to "hollow out" United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biologic medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medicines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which

some erroneously refer to as a “tax loop-hole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(1) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

SEC. 806. 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 nearly 23 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 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 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 CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 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 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission” which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) 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 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 should, 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 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President should 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 should 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 should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

(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.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

(1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(2) prevents a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;

(3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and

(4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

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

(1) The President’s health care law put Washington’s priorities first, and not patients’. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family’s health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged “If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan.” Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President’s health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President’s health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President’s most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual “mandate” could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional;

and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSABILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insurance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 808. 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 Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger gen-

erations 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 preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(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) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations 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;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

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

SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.

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

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outspend the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.

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

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape

and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

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

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

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

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

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: "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 now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, 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 2017 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 \$5,775 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 on-line coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the "high-risk" list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans' Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America's veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor

the VA's progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.

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

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The "accrual method" of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the "cash method" records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

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

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT.—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED 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 its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could "lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings."

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

(B) two hundred separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services

grant programs with an annual cost of \$3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) twenty 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) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage "green building" in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. 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.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) 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.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should 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.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(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 canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should 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 continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

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

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—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.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON "NO BUDGET, NO PAY".

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.

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

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities".

(4) The President's fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration

has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) **POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.**—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated \$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151 billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) **DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.**—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) **SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.**—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Federal Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-49.

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.

If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted.

In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted.

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.

□ 1330

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), I have an amendment at the desk, and I rise to offer an alternative budget on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 201. Direct spending.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2025:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,397,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,011,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,363,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,484,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,611,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,764,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,936,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,113,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,305,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,511,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,723,308,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: -\$29,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$340,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$611,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$639,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$656,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$686,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$722,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$760,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$794,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$836,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$868,535,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$3,364,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,700,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,671,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,715,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,879,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$4,055,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,200,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,434,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,575,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,705,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,935,827,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$3,307,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,688,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,630,273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,676,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,851,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$4,012,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,165,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,401,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,524,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,636,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,881,361,000,000.

(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 2015: -\$909,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -\$677,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -\$266,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -\$191,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$240,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$247,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$228,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -\$287,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -\$218,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -\$125,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -\$158,053,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$18,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$19,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$20,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$21,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$21,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$22,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$22,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$23,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$23,610,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$13,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: \$14,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$14,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$15,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$15,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$16,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$16,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$17,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$17,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$17,867,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority \$596,720,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$590,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$540,897,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$570,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$550,795,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$555,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,791,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$552,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$571,839,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$562,468,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,141,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$573,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$600,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$586,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$615,501,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$605,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,886,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$615,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$648,903,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$627,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$647,739,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$64,111,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,445,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$58,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,004,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,354,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,995,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,155,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,595,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,282,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,267,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,907,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$33,555,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$37,823,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,711,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,815,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,677,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,547,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,054,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,282,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,588,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$42,048,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$41,250,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,159,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$42,156,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$44,309,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$43,225,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$45,477,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,349,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$13,057,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$9,783,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$19,255,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$12,944,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$24,526,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,945,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,929,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,982,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,414,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,166,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,494,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,771,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,596,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,852,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,698,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,879,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,511,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,382,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,331,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,151,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,185,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,978,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$40,203,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$41,149,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$45,346,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$45,322,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$48,757,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$48,914,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$49,001,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$49,788,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$48,904,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$49,699,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$50,582,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,736,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$51,124,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$51,328,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$52,129,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$52,147,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$53,509,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$53,412,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$55,023,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$54,171,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$56,690,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$55,718,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$20,856,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$18,038,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$19,874,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,785,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,441,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,332,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,444,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,695,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,083,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,257,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,090,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,512,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,536,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,994,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,415,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$19,860,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,062,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,505,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,142,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,558,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,462,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$20,934,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority -\$13,573,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$27,482,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$22,596,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,784,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,213,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,423,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,032,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$20,653,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$907,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,632,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,269,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,396,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,513,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,413,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,735,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,809,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,738,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,651,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,205,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$24,536,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$3,995,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$160,537,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$164,218,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$201,058,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$205,978,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$171,812,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$177,425,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$172,680,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$177,406,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$163,577,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$168,774,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$159,506,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$165,356,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$150,440,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$156,858,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$152,880,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$159,980,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$155,363,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$163,113,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$157,903,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$166,022,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$160,484,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$169,482,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$21,665,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,322,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$19,549,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$27,333,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,631,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$27,763,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,963,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$27,471,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,029,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$26,094,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,120,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,152,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,116,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,773,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,129,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,473,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,530,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,273,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,008,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,686,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,534,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,108,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$272,498,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$272,495,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$328,498,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$323,907,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$200,312,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$195,293,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$173,602,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$171,432,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$168,570,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$167,804,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$173,767,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$172,246,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$177,659,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$176,414,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$181,815,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$179,952,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$186,704,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$184,267,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$190,822,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$188,075,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$194,350,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$191,490,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
 - Fiscal year 2015:
 - (A) New budget authority \$495,569,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$486,108,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$534,967,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$541,531,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$585,819,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$585,963,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$609,092,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$610,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,934,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$634,452,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$666,788,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$657,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$690,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$690,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$726,254,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$763,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$762,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$802,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$801,277,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$840,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$839,972,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$542,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$541,942,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$581,875,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,231,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$581,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$581,261,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$589,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$589,302,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$656,196,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$655,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$700,224,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$700,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$748,937,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$748,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$843,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$843,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$864,642,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$863,476,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$876,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$875,217,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$972,674,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$977,111,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$614,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$602,805,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$664,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$654,441,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$670,301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$655,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$648,386,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$636,318,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$661,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$656,010,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$684,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$677,559,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$703,622,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$697,277,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$728,814,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$727,605,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$740,590,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$768,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$755,384,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$795,550,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$787,126,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$31,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$33,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$160,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,625,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$181,292,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$182,078,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$184,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$184,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$179,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$189,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,769,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,649,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,880,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,924,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$197,982,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$211,288,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,116,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$208,612,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$206,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$204,371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$220,777,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,909,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$59,793,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$77,732,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,470,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,498,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,310,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,010,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,460,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,399,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,997,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,698,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,856,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,772,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,860,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$24,945,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,831,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$25,248,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,566,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,282,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,307,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,939,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,072,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,534,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,830,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,631,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,106,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,449,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,243,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,836,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,351,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,693,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,151,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$326,529,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$326,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$377,249,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$430,763,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$499,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$499,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,611,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$557,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$608,177,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$608,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$645,267,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$645,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$682,266,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$682,266,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$716,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$716,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$742,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$742,865,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$760,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$760,812,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority \$5,709,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$5,719,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority \$7,967,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,838,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$4,849,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,181,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$838,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,881,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$2,043,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$398,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$7,633,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$4,727,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$10,868,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$7,855,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$13,111,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$11,070,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$13,541,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$12,146,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$12,881,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$12,413,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$13,641,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$13,025,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority -\$106,825,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$106,825,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority -\$78,012,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$78,012,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,978,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,978,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.

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 2015 is 6.8 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 2015 is 5.1 percent under current law.

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

(A) The People's Budget implements a new tax credit to reward Americans for their hard work. This policy would provide a refundable tax credit for two years for up to \$800 for working individuals earning less than \$95,000 and up to \$1200 for households

earning less than \$190,000. Modeled off the Making Work Pay tax credit, this targeted tax credit would immediately raise disposable income for low and middle-income families.

(B) The People's Budget adopts President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2024.

(C) The People's Budget includes the President's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC or CTC.

(D) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(E) The People's Budget allows students refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(F) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(G) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for preschool nutrition including increases in meal reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(H) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and stability in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$87 billion while savings from the public option are \$218 billion.

(I) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2019.

(J) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the

health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(K) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$157 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For non means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 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 2014 is 5.5 percent under current law.

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

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this would boost real GDP growth by 0.4 percentage points and increase employment by 539,000 jobs in 2015.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts President Obama's reforms to improve system solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget includes funding to replace SGR with a payment system that focuses on equity for primary care and protections for low-income beneficiaries. The budget pays for the reform through added overall revenues, which does not require cost to be passed to Medicare beneficiaries in any form.

(D) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(E) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(F) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$820 billion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and

local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$1 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(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 2016 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2016.

Amend the title so as to read: “Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and fiscal years 2017 through 2025.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to stand while using this visual aid so that I can show clearly that the people’s budget—the people’s budget which we will enter today and will have debate on right now—is the right budget for the American people because it puts the American people first.

The people’s budget has it firmly in mind, “We, the people”; and so when we think about how we should pull together a plan for the Nation’s spending and the Nation’s receipts, revenue, and how we plan out what we are going to spend money on, this people’s budget is the thing.

Let me start just by talking about where we are now and how we must respond to the American people’s needs.

Corporations are pocketing record profits by driving down wages with one hand and increasing the cost of building basic building blocks of a happy life on the other. Where does that leave working families? Huddled around a dinner table with their paychecks, doing the math in their head, wondering if they can make ends meet this month.

This shows, clearly, median income for all families down 8 percent between 2000 and 2012; price of rent is up; medical care is up; child care is up; higher education is way up.

The people’s budget responds directly to the needs of the American people, first, by putting forth the most impor-

tant thing and what we believe is the most important metric and measurement of any budget: How many jobs do you create? The people’s budget creates 8.4 million jobs and raises wages by: investing \$820 billion in infrastructure and rebuilding our Nation’s roads and bridges and our broadband and things like that; providing aid to States to help local governments rehire teachers, firefighters, police officers; supporting a minimum wage increase and increasing funding for worker protection agencies to enforce wage laws; and, finally, funding student loan programs that help businesses grow.

The people’s budget brings down the cost for the building blocks of the American Dream. At a time when too many young people are getting priced out of a college education situation, our budget offers debt-free college for all; and for students who are already paying back their student loans, we offer affordable loan refinancing.

To reduce health care costs, the people’s budget removes the 40 percent excise tax on high-cost health care plans and provides for a public option for consumers. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a public option would offer premiums that are 7 to 8 percent lower than those offered by private plans.

To help parents take care of their children, our budget expands family tax credits and develops a fund to provide eligible low-income families with access to health care.

At the bottom line, Madam Chair, is this: the richest nation in the history of the world at what may well be argued its richest point in its history should be a place where working people can look forward to an American Dream, where they don’t have to huddle around the table at the end of the week and wonder if they are going to make it. So we offer the people’s budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), my cochair.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank Mr. ELLISON for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, in support of the people’s budget, let me simply say, this budget places this Nation’s greatest resource, its people, as the priority. It places value on the needs and hopes of regular working people in this country and the middle class, those aspiring to the middle class who are wanting to leave poverty and low-wage jobs behind.

You are going to hear from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle what a terrible scourge our people’s budget is on raising taxes and spending, but our budget provides to the American people some very distinct and necessary support: jobs, it creates jobs; security in retirement and in difficult times for the American people; fair wages for a fair day’s work; investments in our collective future: education, environment, children, and job training for the future; income sta-

bility and ending income inequality. Those are the priorities within the budget that reflect the needs of the American people. We offer opportunity to Americans who strive for a better life in this budget.

Republicans are clearly angry that we are ending the special treatment of Wall Street buddies. Meanwhile, they have no problem at ending tax credits for low- and middle-income families. Among the few specific tax proposals in the House Republican budget is a promise to spend hundreds of billions on high-income and corporate tax cuts. The trickle down has not trickled, and we continue that process.

Republicans are saying they are seeking to balance the budget. They are balancing this budget on the backs of the middle class, while cutting taxes for the wealthy and well connected, and getting to balance through irresponsible budget gimmicks.

We close corporate loopholes. Offshore tax havens on profits are eliminated. We have a progressive tax rate for income above \$1 million. Our budget is about the American people.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend our friends in the Progressive Caucus for bringing forward a budget. It is not necessarily an easy thing to do, and so we want to thank them for bringing their budget forward.

There aren’t many times in Congress when we actually get to compare like products to like products side by side, so I think it is important to compare exactly where this budget that is being proposed would take us. These are the three budgets that are going to be offered this afternoon by our friends on the other side of the aisle. The Progressive Caucus is the first one. So how does it compare to the budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, that we have offered for this Chamber?

First, taxes; their budget would increase taxes over \$7 trillion over the next 10 years. Spending? Spending increases \$9.3 trillion over our budget. Deficits? \$2.4 trillion increase over the next 10 years. Debt? \$2.8 trillion increase in debt over the Republican option, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. Defense; decreasing defense spending by \$529 billion. When does it get to balance? Never. Never gets to balance.

Actually, Madam Chair, it clearly is not the direction that the American people desire or the American people need. So we stand strongly in favor of A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the dean of the House of Representatives and my good friend.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I stand up to cheer for the Ellison-Grijalva Progressive Caucus budget and what it stands for, and especially for the full employment bill that is woven inside this very spectacular budget.

With 20 million Americans unemployed or underemployed or have given up, we put a fraction of a percent of tax on Wall Street speculators and fees on big polluters to finance more than a trillion dollars in investments to repair our roads and bridges, upgrade energy systems, and prepare our young people to thrive as citizens and workers. This budget will create 8.4 million jobs by 2018.

I came to Congress a number of decades ago to fight for Dr. Martin Luther King's priorities: jobs, justice, and peace. The Progressive Caucus does it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, for the fifth year in a row, the Republicans have put forth a budget that devastates nondefense spending and dismantles Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, and aid to college students. It gives a \$200,000 tax break to the wealthiest Americans while imposing a \$2,000 tax increase on working families. It abandons our critical national infrastructure and the jobs it could create. The Republican budget makes a clear choice: billionaires and corporations before working Americans and seniors.

The Progressive Caucus people's budget offers a clear alternative. This budget creates 8.4 million jobs through investments in infrastructure, worker training, and clean energy. It repeals the devastating sequester cuts and gives the 46½ million Americans living in poverty a path back to prosperity. This alternative budget puts an end to a system where CEOs pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries. It closes tax loopholes that allow corporations to avoid taxes on overseas profits and makes it harder for American businesses to set up shop in low-tax countries.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. NADLER. It makes it harder for American businesses to set up shop in low-tax countries to lower their tax burden. It supports middle-class families through paid parental leave, childcare, and debt-free college. It proves that Congress can pass a budget that supports working families and

seniors, builds an economy that creates jobs and restores faith in the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues to invest in this country and its people. Support the people's budget.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by the Progressive Caucus, they do an invaluable service to the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is sincere and bold. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$7 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget, hike spending by \$9.3 trillion, and run up \$2.8 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over 10 years.

Now, let's begin with a reality check here. Divide \$1 trillion into the number of families in this country. Every trillion dollars we throw around here is roughly \$8,000 taken from an average family's earnings. Some of that they see as direct taxes; some of that they see as increased prices or depressed wages as businesses pass along their costs to consumers and employees; but ultimately it is paid by working Americans because that is where the bulk of our economy rests.

So \$3.8 trillion in increased taxes means roughly \$30,000 taken from the earnings of an average family over the next 10 years; \$2.8 trillion in increased debt means another \$22,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay in future taxes. We are told, well, don't worry, rich people will pay all those taxes. The problem is, there aren't enough rich people in the country to begin to make more than a dent in these numbers. It turns out, many of the so-called rich people aren't rich, and they aren't even people. They are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S.

And remember this dirty little secret of finance: businesses do not pay business taxes. The only three possible ways a business tax can be paid is by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, and by investors through lower earnings. That is your 401(k) or your pension plan that we are talking about.

We are told, well, don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs. Well, the problem is government doesn't create wealth because government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that same dollar out of the economy. True,

we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy.

□ 1345

We see those lost jobs in the lowest labor participation rate in nearly 40 years and in declining median incomes for working Americans.

Here is what government can do—and what the Progressive Democratic budget proposes. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to the other by taxing one and subsidizing the other.

In fact, that is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery. In fact, it has been estimated that if the Obama recovery had mirrored the Reagan recovery, millions more Americans would be working today, and family incomes would be thousands of dollars higher than they are today.

But, of course, Reagan diagnosed the problem very differently than this administration. You remember his famous words: In this great economic crisis, government is not the solution to our problems—government is the problem.

He dramatically reduced the tax burden from 70 percent down to 28 percent. He reduced spending by 2 percent of GDP. He rolled back many of the regulatory burdens imposed on our economy. And the result was one of the most dramatic and prolonged economic expansions in our Nation's history.

And it wasn't just Reagan. We forget that after the 1994 congressional election, Bill Clinton realized his policies weren't working. He came here to this floor in his State of the Union Address and proclaimed the era of Big Government is over. And he made good on that promise. He reached across the aisle to work with the Republican Congress and together they accomplished some amazing things.

They reduced Federal spending by 4 percent of GDP. They approved what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They dramatically reduced entitlement spending by—in Clinton's words—"ending welfare as we know it."

The result was the only four budget surpluses in the last half century and another period of prolonged economic expansion. And the percentage of children living in poverty dropped dramatically.

The budget reported by the House Budget Committee employs these principles that worked when Reagan and Clinton used them and worked when John F. Kennedy and Harry Truman and Warren Harding used them.

The Republican House budget gradually reduces spending as a percentage

of GDP. It calls for a lower, flatter tax rate. It puts our Nation back on a course to a balanced budget. It saves Medicare from bankrupting and collapsing on an entire generation of Americans.

It takes us off the path of debt and doubt and despair that this administration has dogmatically followed and restores us to policies that have repeatedly brought prosperity to our Nation.

Government cannot create jobs, but it can create conditions where jobs multiply and prosper, or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. And we have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

Increase the burdens on the economy and the economy contracts. Lighten the burdens on the economy and it grows and prospers. That is what is out of control with this administration. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works. We know what doesn't work. The House Budget Committee's Balanced Budget for a Stronger America follows principles that have time and again consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The Obama budget, the House Democrats' budget, and the Progressive budget before us now double down on failed policies that have bankrupted nations throughout recorded history.

That is the choice before us today, and we are running out of time to make it. Let's choose wisely.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT) of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, the last speaker said there are two visions for this country, and there are. There is the Republican vision, that is, give more to the wealthy, and there is the Progressive vision of investing in the future so that all Americans can do well.

The Republicans would want you to believe that millionaires and billionaires have the same tax problems as folks on the bottom of the scale, the hard-working Americans who are trying to make a living. But that is not the case.

While the Republican budget gives tax breaks to the wealthy and corporations, the CPC budget boosts and permanently extends the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, which makes stronger working families.

The second thing the CPC budget does, and this is even more for the future, it takes on the issue of student debt, which is a crisis in this country.

We have \$1.3 trillion of debt wrapped around the necks of our children.

Every student and parent knows that the cost of a college education is going up. Millions of students are stuck with loans at high interest rates of 10 percent or larger.

Rather than a Republican budget that keeps students and families indentured to Wall Street banks and the Federal student loan program, our alternative allows students to refinance their loan.

You can refinance your house. Why can't the millions of students in this country refinance their student loans to get a lower rate? It is because the Republicans are tied to the banks and won't let it happen.

Now, if the Republicans had their way, students would continue to choose between paying the rent and paying their student loan debt. That is where kids are today. They are paying more to the banks on their loans than they pay for their rent.

That is not the America I want. It is not the America anybody in this country really wants, except a very few people that the Republicans represent.

I urge you to vote "yes" on the Progressive budget.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Member from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chairman, I would just make the point that as we have this debate on the so-called Progressive budget versus the House budget, that in fact it is Chairman PRICE's committee budget that is indeed the progressive budget. And I say that for this reason. If you stop and think about this notion of being progressive, it is to yield to innovation, to change to flexibility in one's own choice in the way that one does something. And I don't think that there is anything more sacred in that regard than the way that one spends one's own money.

If we were to go with this alternative, what we would see on the tax and spending side is going from 18 percent of GDP up to around 22 percent of GDP. Those are sort of amorphous numbers, but what does that equate to in 2025? It equates to about \$800 billion.

\$800 billion means that you could go and fund the State of South Carolina government 115 times. In other words, you could take that product, multiply it times 115. Think about what we spend on, for instance, transportation here at the Federal level. You could fund it 60 times.

It is a big number by any account. And fundamentally, it is a question of equity. Should 435 folks here in this Chamber decide how folks' money is spent, or should they decide how their money is spent?

I think it is also important because when you think about debt and deficit and interest payments, if we were to go with this alternative, what we are looking at is substantial increases on that front, so much so that I think

that you are looking at the next generation that, to a degree, becomes an indentured servant to the Federal Government.

This isn't my thinking. If you go to the University of Boston, Laurence Kotlikoff has done a study on a thing called generational accounting. It says, What is the imputed cost for a child born in America in terms of tax and spending load? It is about 82 percent. That is 82 percent.

In fairness to Chairman PRICE, what he has done is try to stem that tide and moves us back in the direction so that people have more discretion on how they spend their money. And that is ultimately what is at play.

I would also say that it is progressive from the standpoint in the way that the House budget attempts to deal with entitlements.

Take, for instance, just the healthcare side. On Medicare, there is nothing crazier than trying to do the same thing over and over and expecting a different result because what all the actuaries have said is, if we continue on that road, we are going to see real shortfalls with regard to the Federal Government's ability to handle entitlements.

On ObamaCare, there is nothing progressive about forcing somebody to pay into a system that may or may not fit their needs. On the Medicaid level, there is nothing less progressive than not offering choices. Think about the diversity of the different States we have out there and how different the health care needs may be in South Carolina than the inner city of Los Angeles.

What Chairman PRICE's proposal does, is say: Let's give flexibility to different States so the Governors in those different States can look at what works best for them and their citizens.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Budget Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. POCAN. I thank Mr. ELLISON for all his work with the Progressive Caucus.

Madam Chairman, I have got to tell you, I couldn't disagree more with the good Governor of South Carolina on the budget. To call the Republican Tea Party-infused budget progressive is like calling Velveeta a type of Wisconsin cheese. It just doesn't compare.

The Republican budget means Americans will work harder and earn less. It will be harder to buy a home, it will be harder to send your children to college, and harder to save for a secure retirement. It will do nothing to grow wages or help people get ahead. But it will do one thing for the people in the middle class. It will give you a \$2,000 tax increase so that the wealthiest in this country can get a tax break.

The Progressive Caucus budget is exactly the opposite. The people's budget boosts economic opportunity for more Americans and gives hard-working Americans a raise.

The Progressive Caucus Budget grows our economy and will create 8.4 million jobs by investing in the very things the economy needs most, things like infrastructure and teachers. It puts money into the pockets of workers so that you can get a raise and go out shopping or go to a movie and boost our economy and create jobs via that.

The Progressive budget puts our next generation on a better track by making college more affordable—even debt free—and more accessible for more people.

That is why I am supporting the people's budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, because it will grow your paycheck and create more jobs for hard-working Americans. I encourage my colleagues to join me in that support.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), former chairperson of the Progressive Caucus, the Black Caucus, and Appropriations Committee member.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding, and also thanks to you and Congressman GRIJALVA for your tremendous leadership of the Progressive Caucus and for crafting this people's budget—which is a people's budget.

Today, millions of Americans are working hard and still struggling to make ends meet, and millions are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks are shrinking while corporations reap record profits.

Instead of developing a budget to create jobs and help American families, the House Republican budget “balances” the budget once again on the backs of the most vulnerable to protect giveaways to special interests and the wealthy few.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. This is a moral document. It reflects our values as a nation. It creates more than 8 million good-paying jobs. It includes a plan to lift more than 22 million Americans out of poverty over the next 10 years. It restores funding for SNAP and opens educational opportunity to all.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the wallets of defense contractors at taxpayer expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness.

Make no mistake: the people's budget does what the House Republican budget does not. It works for American families, not special interests, defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to

the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), a freshman Member who is a very well-respected member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise to urge support of the people's budget—the budget put forth by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget is responsive to working people of this country who work hard every day and play by the rules in an attempt to accomplish the noble task of providing for their families in the midst of escalating costs and decreasing wages.

The people's budget recognizes that corporate profits are at their highest level in 85 years, but workers' wages are simultaneously at the lowest level in 65 years.

□ 1400

The Progressive budget was built with the working people of America in mind. It is designed to allow working families to keep more of the money that they earn; access higher wages; and live healthy, productive lives by increasing access to health care and lowering taxes.

It recognizes it is not enough to fight against efforts to take from the middle class to give tax breaks to the rich. We must also fight for tax breaks for the middle class, expand family tax credits, fight for the cost-of-living increases for the retired, provide universal pre-K for children, and help students finance their student loans.

The people's budget makes real working people of this Nation its priority, and I would urge my colleagues to support this, the people's budget.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing us the time to talk about the people's budget. This is the budget that puts 8.4 million people back to work.

Early in this debate, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PRICE, pulled up a chart, and he did a comparison between our budget and the Republican budget, but there was one category that I did not see on that chart, and that is: How many jobs do you create? How many jobs do you create?

This is the right number that we should be comparing budgets on, and I would say, for Americans all over this country looking for work, wanting to make a valuable contribution to themselves and their family, this is the right budget because this is the jobs budget, this is the good work budget, and this is the people's budget.

I would also like to give a big thanks to over 150,000 people who signed a petition in favor of the people's budget. Citizen activists know what is good for their government. They want the people's budget. The Economic Policy Institute, trained economists who have strict numbers and modeling, have come up to help us out, so the people's budget.

We urge a “yes” vote.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend forgets the 8.4 million jobs that will be destroyed in the productive sector as government transfers those 8.4 million, through taxes, to the public sector.

I think the reason these times are so impassioned is because we have arrived at a moment when two very different visions of society are competing for our Nation's future, and they are very much reflected in the budgets put forward by the two parties in this House.

America's prosperity and greatness spring from uniquely American principles of individual freedom, personal responsibility, and constitutionally limited government.

America's Founders created a voluntary society where people are free to make their own decisions, enjoy the fruit of their own labors, take responsibility for their own decisions, and lead their own lives with a minimum of government interference and intrusion.

When someone needs our help, we freely give that help, but we ask in return that they make the effort to support themselves to the extent they can. Our government views no one person or group as more or less worthy than any other.

We are Americans. We will be judged on our own merits, and we will make our own choices, including what kind of car we will drive or how we will raise our children or what kind of lightbulbs we prefer or what we will have for dinner.

Today, a very different vision competes with our future, that of a compulsory society, where our individual rights are subordinated to the mandates of government bureaucrats, where innocent taxpayers are forced to bail out the bad decisions of others, and where consumers are compelled to purchase products or underwrite the losses of politically favored companies.

Under this vision, the purpose of government is not to protect individual freedom, but it is to improve society however those in power decide that it should be improved, to take from those it declares are undeserving to give to those that it declares are deserving—or, to put it more succinctly, to take from each according to his abilities and to give to each according to his needs. That is what this is all about.

Not more than 100 steps from where we debate right now, Thomas Jefferson reviewed the bountiful resources of the Nation and asked:

With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens, a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America put forward by the House Budget Committee, and let us be

clear, the various Democratic plans, including the one before us now, fundamentally reject these American principles and replace them with values that are alien and antithetical to those that built our Nation.

This is the question that our generation must decide in all of its forms, including the question put to us today by this substitute amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016."

I support the CPC's ANS, "The People's Budget" because it fixes an economy that, for too long, has failed to provide the opportunities American families need to get ahead.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" Budget with its discredited and unworkable economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CPC's People's Budget, here is what we can expect: 1. 8.4 million good paying jobs by 2018; 2. \$1.9 trillion investment in America's future; and 3. \$820 billion investment in infrastructure and transportation improvements.

The People's Budget will usher in a new era of broad-based and shared prosperity by: 1. repealing the draconian sequester and all Budget Control Act spending caps; 2. increasing discretionary funding to invest in working families; 3. reversing harmful cuts to social safety net; and 4. investing in veterans, women, and working families.

Under the People's Budget, millions of working families will see an increase in their purchasing power because the budget: 1. creates more than 8 million good jobs by 2018; 2. includes a four percent raise for federal workers; 3. provides for paid leave and child care; 4. supports an increase in the minimum wage increase and collective bargaining; and 5. fully funds programs to make housing affordable and accessible for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, Americans cannot reach their full potential if they lack educational opportunities, health security, or are saddled with crushing educational debts.

That is why the CPC's People's Budget invests in K-12 and provides free pre-school, and provides debt-free college to every student and refinancing of student loans on terms favorable to students trying to get ahead, not banks.

The CPC's People's Budget repeals the excise tax on high-priced workers plans, removes the prohibition barring CMS to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for Medicare recipients, and reauthorizes the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Mr. Chair, because the People's Budget is for all persons in our country, it adopts comprehensive immigration reform and welcomes the substantial economic benefits it will generate.

Everyone knows that our current outdated immigration laws have failed workers, families, businesses and increasingly, our nation's immigrants.

Employers are unable to hire the workers they need. Immigrant workers are exploited.

Families trying to reunite legally are separated for many years, and millions of individuals are forced to live in the shadows.

The People's Budget helps immigrants integrate into American society and participate in the economy by becoming entrepreneurs, small business owners, innovators and future job creators.

With comprehensive immigration reform, the federal budget deficit will be reduced by \$197 billion over the next decade and \$700 billion over the next 20 years according to a report by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Chair, I could go on at length explaining why the CPC's People's Budget is superior to the House Republican's "Worker Harder, Get Less" budget.

But let me conclude by noting that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards; the CPC's People's Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CPC's People's Budget.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an alternative budget on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Sec. 2. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 3. Major functional categories.

Sec. 4. Direct spending.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,885,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,001,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,122,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,262,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,412,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,570,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,739,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,923,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,117,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,321,625,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$209,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$226,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$253,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$280,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$305,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$323,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$346,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$369,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$393,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$415,719,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,491,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,462,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,553,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,698,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,869,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,023,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,186,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,377,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,568,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,742,339,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,257,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,452,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,568,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,707,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,848,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,990,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,163,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,336,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,513,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,700,933,000,000.

(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 2016: -\$371,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -\$450,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -\$445,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$444,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$436,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$419,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -\$424,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -\$413,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -\$396,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -\$379,308,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,024,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$19,703,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,395,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,078,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$21,753,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$22,413,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,061,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$23,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$24,385,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$25,022,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,807,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$14,338,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$14,876,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,438,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,016,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$16,605,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$17,232,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,886,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$18,566,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,278,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$570,380,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$582,430,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$582,126,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$573,904,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$593,364,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$575,837,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$601,639,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$588,174,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$607,930,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$597,134,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$620,245,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$606,885,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$632,525,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$622,398,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$645,784,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$630,255,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$659,080,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$638,461,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$672,415,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$655,940,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$56,611,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$51,973,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$49,862,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,951,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$51,103,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,224,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$51,779,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,273,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$52,192,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,558,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$53,269,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$50,887,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$54,555,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$51,578,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$55,647,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$52,330,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$56,743,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$53,251,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$57,872,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$54,149,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$39,059,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$34,705,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,672,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$34,712,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,302,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,768,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,623,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,517,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,948,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$33,822,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,606,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$34,040,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$35,279,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$34,618,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$35,962,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$35,276,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$36,658,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$35,952,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$37,372,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$36,650,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$9,210,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,041,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,587,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,554,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,559,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,074,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,491,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,427,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,512,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,737,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,614,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,920,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,714,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,074,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,846,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,280,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$6,966,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,467,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$7,102,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$6,635,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$46,870,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$45,455,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$45,024,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$46,590,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,212,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,919,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$42,685,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$43,574,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,638,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,001,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,839,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,057,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,963,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,257,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$44,633,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,866,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$45,398,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$44,915,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$46,321,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$45,727,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,384,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,078,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,162,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,089,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$25,304,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$24,533,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,879,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,060,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,301,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,994,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,723,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,260,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,575,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,046,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,192,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,650,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,243,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,660,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,503,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,975,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$15,582,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,936,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$13,976,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$730,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,606,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$3,487,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,994,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$5,176,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,656,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$13,902,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$406,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,460,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$2,066,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,422,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$3,341,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,755,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$4,309,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$15,425,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$4,736,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$245,892,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$122,661,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$176,674,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$146,865,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$131,913,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$156,511,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$123,250,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$155,123,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$122,563,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$141,858,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$124,274,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$124,077,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$105,359,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$117,792,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$107,204,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$116,434,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$109,091,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$116,058,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$111,012,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$116,517,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$48,976,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,712,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$167,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$116,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$166,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$170,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$147,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$161,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$144,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$148,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$149,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$146,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$147,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$149,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$152,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$149,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$156,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$153,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$158,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$157,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$159,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$160,116,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$523,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$534,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$567,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$571,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$592,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$594,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$618,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$619,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$650,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$640,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$669,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$669,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$703,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$702,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$736,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$736,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$772,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$772,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$808,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$808,818,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$597,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$578,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$582,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$582,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$592,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$591,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$659,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$659,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$705,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$704,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$755,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$755,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$853,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$852,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$876,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$875,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$891,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$890,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$989,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$994,440,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$552,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$542,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$562,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$553,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$565,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$554,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$578,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$574,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$591,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$586,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$599,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$626,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$625,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$637,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$631,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$648,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$636,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$671,986,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$664,262,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$178,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$177,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$177,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$179,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$173,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$173,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$182,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$183,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$187,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$186,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$190,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$190,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$202,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$201,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$198,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$197,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$195,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$194,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$208,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$207,621,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,319,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,683,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,267,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,245,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,396,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,729,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,155,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$368,027,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$421,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$421,270,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$495,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$495,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$560,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,645,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$666,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,257,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$712,670,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$712,670,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$756,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$756,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$794,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$794,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$824,027,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$824,027,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$36,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$20,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$9,339,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,161,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,429,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,314,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$165,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,458,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$52,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$52,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,072,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,647,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,180,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,313,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$78,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-
 al War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,085,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,000,000.

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 2016 is 6.8 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 2016 is 4.6 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 2016 is 5.4 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 2016 is 5.5 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 in-

comes 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 Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.
 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus has a long history of submitting fiscally sound and morally responsible budget alternatives that emphasize our commitment to eradicating poverty in America.

The budget, which is endorsed by groups such as the National Education Association, SEIU, AFSCME, Planned Parenthood, and PolicyLink, focuses on a fairer Tax Code, ending the sequestration battle, creating jobs, and eliminating poverty and reducing the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget is a plan that will work to protect and enhance the social safety net that continues to save millions from the ravages of poverty. Our goal is to increase economic opportunities for all Americans through significant and sustained investments in education and infrastructure, affordable housing, domestic manufacturing, small businesses, and job training.

We propose, Mr. Chairman, significant investments to further accelerate our economic recovery and ensure no community in America is left behind. Additionally, no other budget on Capitol Hill prioritizes the plight of voting rights enforcement into the Federal fiscal map or contemplates \$3 billion saved over 10 years by limiting mandatory minimum sentences for non-violent drug offenders.

Once again, the House Republican budget relies on partisan rhetoric and gimmicks instead of making the tough choices needed to invest in our Nation, grow our economy, and provide economic opportunities for hard-working Americans.

House Republicans' unrealistic and unworkable budget continues the sequester for domestic spending this year and cuts that spending drastically in future years, disinvesting in our Nation and asking the most vulnerable Americans to carry the burden of deficit reduction.

We cannot allow their budget to move forward on the backs of the

American people. I request my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, as it is a budget that reflects the priorities of our nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who really did the heavy lifting, along with Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, in crafting our budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) be allowed to manage the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I want to commend our friends in the CBC for coming forward with a budget. It is not an easy thing to do, having worked these last 10 or 11 weeks to try to fashion a budget that could be dealt with on the floor of the House.

I also want to just point out that this is one of the few opportunities that we have, as Congress, to look at a comparison of apples to apples, of similar work products with each other.

There are three budgets that will be offered by our friends on the other side. We have talked just now about the Progressive Caucus. In the middle is the CBC budget, the one that we are discussing right now.

I just want to highlight the differences between this budget, from a numerical standpoint, with the budget that has been offered by the Republican majority, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

In the area of taxes, what does the CBC budget do? Increases taxes by over \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years. Spending? Increases spending by over \$7 trillion over the next 10 years, compared to the Republican budgets. Deficits? Increases deficits by over \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. Debt? Same, \$4 trillion added to the debt.

What do they spend on the defense of our Nation at these perilous times? Decreased spending on defense by \$314 billion.

The big question is: When does their budget ever get to balance? Because a balanced budget is what we need to get this economy rolling again. When does it ever get to balance? The answer is never.

It is a worthy endeavor that our friends in the CBC have undertaken; however, it is not right for the country and certainly doesn't stand up to the scrutiny of A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), and I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong priorities. The underlying Republican budget is not a serious plan. It contains trillions of dollars in tax cuts, but claims to be revenue neutral, without showing a dime's worth of tax increases that will be necessary to make it revenue neutral.

It includes trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts, and many of the specified cuts will not be made. For example, are we really going to repeal Medicare as we know it?

If you actually believe that the Republican majority will carry out their plan, it would actually devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities across the Nation.

The Republican budget assumes that sequestration cuts will be enacted and then adds an additional \$759 billion in nondefense discretionary spending cuts. That is the part of the budget that invests in education, workforce training, scientific research, transportation, and infrastructure.

In stark contrast to the Republican budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget actually puts real numbers on the page. We show our arithmetic. The CBC budget proposes \$2.7 trillion in additional revenue over the next decade, but our budget lays out \$5.6 trillion in specific revenue options and loophole closings that Congress could adopt to achieve that goal.

With this additional revenue, we eliminate sequestration; we propose a \$500 billion jobs package that will put millions of people back to work, and we include more than \$300 billion above the President's budget for significant and sustained investments in programs that have been instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Our budget also calls for a raise in the minimum wage, adds a public option to the health insurance marketplace, and calls for the passage of comprehensive immigration reform. Factoring in the paid-for elimination of sequestration, our revenue enhancements, CBO's analysis of the deficit reduction impacts of both enacting a public option and comprehensive immigration reform, our budget credibly reduces the 10-year deficit by \$1.9 trillion when compared to CBO's March baseline.

Mr. Chairman, our budget is a credible alternative to the vague and unrealistic plan offered by our Republican

colleagues, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

Every day, I hear from my constituents in Tennessee who are still struggling to find work and make ends meet. This is the result of the slowest economic recovery in American history, and, in parts of my district, communities are still plagued by double-digit unemployment rates; yet this amendment would raise taxes on Americans by \$3.2 trillion. This would be on top of the \$1.6 trillion in new taxes already imposed under President Obama.

Raising taxes on small business is exactly the opposite of what is needed to reduce unemployment, get Americans back to work, and grow our economy.

Even with this \$3.2 trillion tax increase, which would be the largest in American history, this budget would never balance. In fact, compared to A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, this substitute amendment would add \$4 trillion to our debt over the next 10 years.

□ 1415

This is because this amendment would increase spending by \$7 trillion, compared to the House Republican budget. In fact, it increases spending for every category in the budget except for our national defense. This budget would take \$1 trillion of its proposed tax hikes and use all of this money to break the Budget Control Act spending caps for nondefense spending only. This is unacceptable.

At a time when we are faced with Russian aggression in the Ukraine, the threat of ISIS in the Middle East, and an increasingly unpredictable security environment, we need to adequately fund our servicemen and -women. That is why the House Republican budget would comply with the current spending caps in the law but still adds \$387 billion in defense spending over a 10-year window, all while balancing the budget without any tax increases.

Long before I served on the Budget Committee, I got a crash course on budgeting 101 as a single working mother. And in those years, I raised three children on a nurse's salary, teaching me how to live within my means and stretch my dollars.

Mr. Chair, I have had to work to make ends meet, so I know how important our social safety net is for those in need. I want to see this safety net strengthened and preserved for future generations.

However, this budget falls into the trap of measuring how much we care by how much we spend. Federal programs and initiatives should be evaluated based on their outcomes, by how many people we help get out of poverty, help to get back to work, and help to get the training and the education they need.

One example is our Federal job training program. In 2011, the Government

Accountability Office, the GAO, issued a report that found 47 overlapping Federal job training programs, costing \$18 billion in 2009 alone. The report showed that this duplication was not serving workers that needed training and was not responsibly using Federal dollars. If we want to help workers who need training, there is a clear need to reform these programs to improve outcomes.

That is why last year, this House passed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. By the way, it was bipartisan legislation which was signed into law and made important reforms to Federal job training programs, better helping workers looking for a job while responsibly using taxpayer dollars. This substitute budget would take a step back from these reforms and simply spend an additional \$13 billion on these programs without any reform. Unfortunately, this is just one example of this substitute amendment doubling down on failed policies of the past.

Additionally, it would create a \$1 billion slush fund for a national stimulus program. Just like the previously failed stimulus program, this would do nothing to create new jobs and simply adds another \$100 billion to our debt, which our children and our grandchildren will have to pay.

It would also reverse bipartisan reforms made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, commonly called SNAP, and increase spending. If we want to protect those who are most in need, we need to find ways to reform the SNAP program.

The substitute amendment would go further than even ObamaCare has, calling for the creation of a public health insurance option, a backdoor way to nationalizing our health care system. This idea is so radical that when Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress and the White House, it was not adopted. Health care should be patient-centered, allowing Americans to make decisions with their doctors and their families, not with the Federal Government.

Instead of doubling down on ObamaCare, House Republicans want to see greater choice, more affordability, increased quality, and innovation in health care, which is why our budget proposes a market-based, patient-centered reform.

We also will provide structural reforms to Medicare and Medicaid, which provide care to our Nation's seniors and those in need. The House Republican budget would make no changes for those who are near or currently in retirement, and provides States the flexibility to administer their Medicaid programs to meet the needs of the people in their own State.

Doing nothing to reform this unsustainable path that Medicare and Medicaid are on, as this substitute amendment does, ensures that we will go bankrupt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to another speaker.

The case has been made that this budget raises taxes. Sure, it does. But the Republican budget also raises taxes.

They have cut the AMT. They have reduced the marginal rate. There are other tax extenders. And they say it is revenue-neutral. The only way you can make it revenue-neutral, Mr. Chair, is to raise taxes—trillions of dollars to make it revenue-neutral. They don't show a dime of taxes. The difference between that budget and ours is, we list specific options that could be used.

They also would repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they keep all the taxes that paid for it.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding, and I also thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' budget and also for his work as ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget. I want to, once again, commend Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for leading us to this point and for putting together a budget which really is a budget that reflects our values as a Nation.

As a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I know that our national budget is a moral document and a statement of our national priorities. The budget that my Republican colleagues have put forward does nothing for families struggling to find a job or those living in poverty. Instead, it includes draconian cuts to programs which, over the last 50 years, cut poverty by one-third, thanks to the War on Poverty.

The Republican plan cuts the safety net while 45 million people still are living in poverty.

Mr. Chairman, poverty in the African American community is 27.2 percent. In the Latino community, it is 23.5 percent.

Our budget addresses this problem with the Half in Ten plan. By coordinating Federal programs and agencies under a national strategy, we will cut poverty by 50 percent in one decade. That is 22 million people lifted out of poverty in the next 10 years.

This budget outlines a clear package for eradicating poverty rather than foolishly turning vital programs into block grants.

We expand food assistance for our children and seniors. We extend unemployment compensation for those still looking for work following the recent recession. We give America a raise and,

thereby, boost our economy, because no one should be working and living in poverty.

With regard to the Pentagon, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in cost savings by bringing a culture of financial accountability to the Pentagon.

As in the previous budgets, the CBC invests savings from cuts in the ballistic missile defense program to be used by the Defense Department to implement the remaining GAO recommendations.

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

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

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Also, let me just say, our budget employs the 10-20-30 formula championed by our leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

By directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years, we will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

A vote for the CBC budget really is a vote with the conscience of the Congress. It is a message to the American people that you stand with those who are working hard to find a job or working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable to keep giveaways to the superwealthy is unacceptable, and that is not the American way.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the best way to lift someone out of poverty is to give them an opportunity to have a job, and that is what A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America does. It does cut taxes, allowing for more job opportunities and an increase in wages for the workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, could you advise us of the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 6¾ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I would like to engage the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) in a colloquy.

I was wondering if it were possible for the gentleman to yield the Congressional Black Caucus maybe 4 to 6 minutes of his time. We have many speakers, and we have worked very hard on this budget. You know, the majority gets its way, but the minority ought to get its say.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentledady yielding.

The gentledady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) controls our time, and we do have another speaker or two. But as soon as your time expires and if we have time remaining, then we will be happy to yield some time to the CBC.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much for that courtesy.

Mr. Chair, it is really my privilege to discuss the social safety net programs that are at the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

The CBC acknowledges the efforts on the part of the majority to address debt and deficits, but we cannot do it on the backs of the poor.

Much has been made of jobs being the answer. We agree with that, but there are the disabled, elderly, and children who comprise the poor who cannot and do not work.

The Republican budget proposes \$759 billion in cuts to the nondefense discretionary budget below the already damaging sequester levels. That is in addition to the more than \$4 trillion in cuts to mandatory spending, a lifeline to benefits like food stamps, Medicaid, and Medicare.

The CBC budget offers Americans a choice. In stark contrast to the Republican budget, we invest in low-income families and students and provide security so that our impoverished, our infirm, and our elderly and children are treated with dignity and respect. It protects the social safety net.

It rejects the block granting of Medicaid and food stamps and voucherizing Medicare. It restores the TANF emergency contingency fund, rather than the \$34 billion OCO slush fund. We do \$2.5 billion rather than \$34 billion for a slush fund.

It also restores our emergency unemployment insurance for all Americans. Millions of Americans have exhausted these benefits. And it invests in so many other vital programs, such as WIC, LIHEAP, public housing, homeless assistance, Section 8 and rural housing programs, Social Services Block Grant, Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I want to thank the chair and my CBC colleagues for working with me on this very worthy budget. Please vote "yes" on this alternative budget.

Mrs. BLACK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for diligently preparing this budget.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote for the CBC budget. Mr. Chair, the budget that we adopt will speak to our values as a Congress and our values as a country.

I am sad to say, Mr. Chair, that the Republican budget says that we are a country without values and lacking a conscience. The Republican budget

makes severe cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, education, job training, and transportation so that it can fund tax cuts to the wealthy.

I want to be crystal clear. The Republican budget is a financial hocus pocus that will not put us on a path to financial stability.

□ 1430

However, Mr. Chairman, it is a certain path to a dire moral bankruptcy that is counter to the soul of our great country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, the CBC budget is a financially superior budget that invests in what makes this country exceptional. The CBC budget eradicates poverty by increasing economic opportunities through significant and sustained investments in education, infrastructure, affordable housing, manufacturing, small business, and job training.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side talk about the ability to lift people out of poverty. We have the ability today to lift 14 million people out of poverty simply by raising the minimum wage. If we create more minimum wage jobs, we are only increasing the number of people who will still live in poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget rewards those who make political contributions, and the CBC budget rewards those who contribute to society and the greater good.

In closing, the CBC budget recognizes that working families in this country are getting shortchanged, so our budget tries to level the playing field and give more opportunities to those working families so that they can enjoy the economic prosperity that the investor class has enjoyed since our efforts to come out of the Great Recession.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my fellow colleague of the Budget Committee and also fellow Tennessean.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ms. MOORE. She is still on the floor and serves on the Budget Committee with us. She is such a good, productive, and contributory member of that committee. I appreciate the perspective that she brings, and I know that she has worked diligently on the budget that the CBC is bringing before us today.

I do not support that budget. I support the committee print that we have. Mr. Chairman, here is exactly why.

We all know Washington does not have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. Last year, more revenues came into our Federal coffers than ever. It is always important, as we talk about the budget, to put in perspective where this money comes from. It comes from hard-working taxpayers, and the government has not one single penny to spend until a taxpayer sends that money in.

Now, the budget that we have brought out of committee does some-

thing quite significant. Number one, it will reduce Federal spending \$5.5 trillion over the next 10 years. That is an important thing to do, and here is why.

We are continuing to borrow somewhere around 30 cents for every dollar that we are spending. It is bouncing right now, I think, between 28 and 30 cents for every dollar. That is too much. It gets to be a fairness issue for future generations.

We have got \$18 trillion worth of debt, and \$9 trillion worth of that debt has come on our books in the past 6 years. That is not fair to future generations. It is not fair to our Nation's security.

Getting the debt under control is important. That is why a budget that saves \$5.5 trillion and comes to balance—comes to balance—for our annual outlays in 9 years is significantly important.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

You see, when we talk about what will be accomplished by our budget and we talk about fairness, it is imperative that the spending be brought under control. What we are bringing forward is a way for us to bring that into balance and to begin to get the agencies, even reducing the Federal workforce by 10 percent, making certain that we are rightsizing that workforce. Those are steps that should be taken. They are steps that we ought to be taking, and it is something that we all should support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to offer my appreciation to Ranking Member SCOTT both for his service on the Education Committee as a ranking member, but also for his continuing efforts and work on a very, very positive step, great step, toward changing America.

There is a premise in the Republican budget, two premises or underlying thoughts that I vigorously disagree with. As I stand in explaining or supporting the Congressional Black Caucus budget, let me also say that I rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget—and I will provide a statement into the Record—for its efforts in improving America.

But the premise of the budget of our friends on the other side of the aisle is that if you are poor, if you are in need of help, then it is either your fault or you are taking advantage of the government's charity and largess.

Walk a mile in the district that I represent—and many districts across America—and you will find parents who get up at 4 and 6 in the morning to jobs that are less than the minimum wage in some instances, or are the minimum wage, working very hard to support their families. Those individuals deserve an equal opportunity.

I am grateful that this budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, talks about a comprehensive jobs program totaling some \$500 billion—a mere \$500 billion—over 3 years.

We understand that people want to work. This involves a national direct job creation program, a program to assist local government in hiring and retaining teachers and law enforcement, investing to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, rebuilding neighborhoods, and, as well, understanding that you can't work harder and get less.

Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that I am very supportive of in this budget, one that others would not think of, is ending the Cradle to Prison Pipeline.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in fact, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that limiting the imposition of mandatory minimum sentences on nonviolent drug offenders would have an overall net savings of \$3 billion over 10 years. This is a budget that goes to the heart of the concerns of Americans who may not have the right start in life but deserve an opportunity.

I want to be able to support a budget that, in essence, reduces the deficit and takes away sequestration, not piles taxes on persons who cannot afford them and creates very little jobs and undermines the social network that is necessary for those of us who believe we are, in fact, our brothers' and sisters' keeper.

I ask you to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget. It is smart, it is strong, and it leads America forward.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons: 1. It ends the threat of sequestration; 2. It will accelerate our economic recovery; 3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and 4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$1.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program totaling \$500 billion over three years.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's longterm economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing: 1. \$100 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program; 2. \$50 billion for school Modernization; 3. \$50 billion to assist local government hire and retain teachers, law

enforcement and first responder Jobs; 4. \$230 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure; 5. \$50 billion to rebuilding neighborhoods and communities not fully recovered from the Great Recession of 2008; 6. \$13 billion for job training programs; and 7. \$7 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our country, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the "10-20-30" policy for federal spending.

Under the "10-20-30" policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$1.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I appreciate being given some time at the last minute.

Mr. Chairman, the wealth gap and racial wealth gap have reached record levels, and alarming statistics tell the story. Mr. Chairman, 46.5 million Americans are living in poverty, and comparable numbers are even worse in the African American community and other communities of color. For decades, we have had policies and made funding decisions that have benefited only a few at the expense of the middle class and minorities. The Great Recession and subsequent years of budget cuts have only made things worse for these communities.

While the Republicans' budget demonstrates their commitment to maintaining this inequality, the budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus today attempts to rebuild and restore what we lost, especially in the housing sector, which is why it has my support.

First, the CBC budget retains a robust Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which Congress created to protect all Americans from predatory loans that led to millions of foreclosures, many of which were in the African American community. The CBC budget also makes critical investments in affordable housing programs, including fully funding public housing and fully restoring Section 8 housing choice vouchers lost due to sequestration.

The CBC budget would also invest much-needed resources to add over 20,000 new beds for the homeless across our country. Investments in these important rental and homeless assistance programs is especially important given the fact that we have nearly 8 million households in America for whom safe, decent, and affordable housing is not available to them.

Put simply, the Republican budget would widen the wealth gap in this country; the CBC budget would help eliminate it.

Further, the CBC budget strengthens our housing market, our financial system and economic stability as a whole. I urge that all Members of this House vote in favor of it and in favor of putting our country back on a sustainable economic path.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her courtesy in extending additional time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is a percentage of the economy, the Republican underlying budget is 40 percent lower than the previous low in half a century. It is only balanced because it is missing a couple of trillion dollars where you cut

taxes and say it is revenue neutral. There is no indication that the taxes will be restored. It is unrealistic because the level of cuts won't be made.

You are not going to repeal Medicare as you know it. We have tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 50 times and haven't been able to do it. It is interesting that they want to repeal the services but not the taxes. There are substantial cuts in Pell grants and increases in student loans. Transportation initiatives are just about zeroed out.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget has specific tax increases. It shows that we make money by comprehensive immigration reform and the public option. We pay to eliminate sequestration. We create jobs, eliminate poverty, and have a realistic budget.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would adopt the Congressional Black Caucus budget as a realistic priority, with the right priorities we would adopt the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just contrast these two budgets just a little bit. As we look at a stronger America—and our balanced budget does provide for a stronger America—we see that the Congressional Black Caucus budget is one that will increase our debt for our children and our grandchildren and increase taxes. Neither one of these is going to help our economy grow nor get people out of poverty.

Our budget balances in less than 10 years. A balanced budget means a healthier economy today and greater opportunity for tomorrow, helping to raise people out of poverty.

The budget also repeals the unworkable and unfair ObamaCare plan and starts over with more choice.

The budget boosts our defense spending, helping to provide defense for our country and support for our men and women.

The budget eliminates the double dipping of the disability insurance and the unemployment insurance and establishes a plan that will strengthen the Social Security trust fund rather than having the trust fund be depleted.

The budget saves and strengthens Medicare, ending that \$700 billion ObamaCare raid that was in the President's proposal.

Mr. Chairman, all of these things help to get us on the path and on the course to a successful America where we can be proud to hand our children and our grandchildren a successful country whereby they can know the kinds of opportunities that we have had and live the American Dream. So I urge a "no" vote on this budget amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the CBC Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

As has been highlighted during today's debate, the Federal budget is a blueprint for our

nation. It is a statement of our national priorities and of our national values.

Our budget should lay the groundwork to secure a strong middle class, create more jobs, and grow paychecks.

We should be working to create a level playing field for all Americans.

We cannot continue with these short-term fixes which lately have become all too common in Congress.

For instance, in May, the Highway Trust Fund is set to expire—again.

Yet, more than sixty-five percent of America's roads are in need of repair and the American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation's infrastructure a D in its most recent report card.

We could be creating thousands of jobs—from real estate to construction work—if we got serious about investing in infrastructure.

As the conscious of the Congress. The CBC budget focuses on creating jobs and giving hard-working Americans families a fair-share.

Our CBC budget would provide \$230 billion for our nation's infrastructure—providing an immediate investment to help modernize our roads, bridges, and tunnels, as well as providing dollars to build new and improve existing commuter and public transportation systems.

We cannot delay or rely on short term funding patches that seem to become the norm in this Republican led Congress.

Mr. Chair, when we rebuild our roads and modernize our nation's transportation, we create and maintain good-paying jobs.

That's the best investment we can make of taxpayer dollars. Not only do we keep Americans safe, but we invest in our greatest resource—the American worker. That's what I call a bang for your buck.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

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

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

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

□ 1445

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-49.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.

Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

Sec. 204. Policy statement on reconciliation to repeal Obamacare.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 302. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.

Sec. 303. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 304. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 305. Limitation on advance appropriations.

Sec. 306. Fair value credit estimates.

Sec. 307. Limitation on long-term spending.

Sec. 308. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

Sec. 309. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.

Sec. 310. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.

Sec. 311. Rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 401. Direct spending.

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.

Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the replacement of Obamacare.

Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.

Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.

Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation reform.

Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Sec. 510. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.

Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve account for reforming SNAP.

Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security Disability Insurance Reform.

Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 514. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.

Sec. 515. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.

Sec. 516. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

TITLE VI—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 601. Policy statement on health care law repeal.

Sec. 602. Policy statement on replacing the President's health care law.

Sec. 603. Policy statement on Medicare.

- Sec. 604. Policy statement on Medicaid State flexibility block grants.
- Sec. 605. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 606. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
- Sec. 607. Policy statement on reform of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 608. Policy statement on work requirements.
- Sec. 609. Policy statement on a carbon tax.
- Sec. 610. Policy statement on regulation of greenhouse gases by the Environmental Protection Agency.
- Sec. 611. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 612. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 613. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 614. Policy statement on energy production.
- Sec. 615. Policy statement on Federal regulatory policy.
- Sec. 616. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 617. Policy statement on Federal funding of abortion.
- Sec. 618. Policy statement on transportation reform.
- Sec. 619. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 620. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 621. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 622. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 623. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 624. Policy statement on creation of a Committee to Eliminate Duplication and Waste.
- Sec. 625. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.
- Sec. 626. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 627. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.
- Sec. 628. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 629. No Budget, no Pay.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

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

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

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

- 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.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$0.
- (2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
 - Fiscal year 2016: \$2,804,255,329,803.
 - Fiscal year 2017: \$2,795,462,458,903.
 - Fiscal year 2018: \$2,865,997,991,741.
 - Fiscal year 2019: \$3,000,376,760,861.
 - Fiscal year 2020: \$3,108,966,585,790.
 - Fiscal year 2021: \$3,172,280,451,129.
 - Fiscal year 2022: \$3,271,239,346,757.
 - Fiscal year 2023: \$3,353,376,032,969.
 - Fiscal year 2024: \$3,385,534,274,531.
 - Fiscal year 2025: \$3,492,980,109,634.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$2,875,014,856,384.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,814,832,468,381.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$2,849,474,859,887.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$2,972,316,101,289.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,068,172,096,646.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,144,578,956,503.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,261,322,193,088.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$3,323,765,840,982.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$3,340,157,830,662.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$3,464,735,098,225.

(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 2016: -\$208,259,856,384.
- Fiscal year 2017: -\$51,504,468,381.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$8,656,140,113.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$1,830,898,711.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$31,237,903,354.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$97,384,043,497.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$127,365,806,912.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$226,622,159,018.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$381,986,169,338.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$440,912,901,775.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$18,913,744,958,460.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$19,314,491,964,331.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$19,563,830,455,326.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$19,857,958,879,371.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$20,123,855,366,287.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$20,351,214,337,587.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$20,715,329,820,423.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$20,901,532,189,180.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$20,717,769,565,646.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$20,684,027,272,338.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$13,703,981,750,475.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$13,960,949,960,296.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$14,067,434,872,731.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$14,248,184,941,570.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$14,422,683,320,242.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$14,587,672,210,472.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$14,936,858,695,742.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$15,125,854,409,576.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$14,963,760,099,108.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$15,014,505,127,509.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$578,280,777,857.
 - (B) Outlays, \$613,862,153,570.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$572,025,184,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$586,422,160,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$604,237,912,000.

- Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$617,552,672,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$37,513,493,257.
 - (B) Outlays, \$41,995,505,479.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$38,762,853,450.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,934,846,949.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$39,651,643,950.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,866,220,775.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$40,528,536,020.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,354,273,029.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$41,461,865,977.
 - (B) Outlays, \$38,697,741,578.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$41,925,063,701.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,232,179,719.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$43,126,001,914.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,982,610,336.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$44,095,485,241.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,732,800,911.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$45,103,629,772.
 - (B) Outlays, \$41,553,888,595.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$46,133,401,274.
 - (B) Outlays, \$42,416,153,641.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,003,392,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$28,932,305,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$28,924,301,820.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$29,578,662,625.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,357,268,851.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,226,743,853.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,798,265,570.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,904,449,193.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,387,989,039.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$31,583,742,872.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,957,291,773.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$32,292,588,187.
 - (B) Outlays, \$31,636,998,973.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,002,947,480.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,338,214,946.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,741,782,114.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,058,954,535.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,488,239,558.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,794,801,398.
- (4) Energy (270):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$-5,761,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$1,930,371,957.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, -\$3,819,314,062.
 - (B) Outlays, -\$1,757,967,962.

- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,728,702,937.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,111,452,050.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,096,589,163.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,078,305,078.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,254,611,266.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,969,957,520.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,171,638,088.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,763,905,675.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,599,805,029.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,680,623,026.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,195,039,484.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,596,392,352.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,064,102,846.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,606,962,951.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,109,301,299.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,918,880,787.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$31,299,572,447.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,745,933,147.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,804,397,584.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,763,424,433.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,940,706,078.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,072,114,262.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,545,716,150.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,019,236,283.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,800,053,945.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,914,442,144.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,731,162,151.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,002,142,690.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,463,492,711.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,583,695,102.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,834,190,867.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,011,836,980.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,301,960,627.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,902,619,669.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,926,499,137.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,416,919,831.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$19,898,010,335.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,942,095,280.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,827,846,850.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,957,388,865.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,738,376,840.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,154,062,249.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,657,292,553.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,032,522,337.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,587,456,346.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,144,471,168.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,048,816,297.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,608,414,371.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,995,149,863.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,586,093,026.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,569,077,258.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,145,484,076.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,766,828,555.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,306,333,800.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,999,880,260.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,600,090,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$16,616,676,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,102,500.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,296,710.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,355,063.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,997,848,520.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,800,690,294.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,586,750,251.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,060,242.
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,356,095.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,465,808.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,768,710,970.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,741,907,919.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,106,102.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,387,525.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,305,538,861.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,990,905,601.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,008,871.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,433,193.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,844,501,407.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$32,470,539,628.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,973,708,016.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,354,221,079.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,459,750,057.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,202,314,885.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,144,457,480.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,630,814,158.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,324,272,537.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,886,671,678.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,004,790,643.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,163,658,354.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,472,273,861.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,515,161,060.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,923,592,736.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,915,482,431.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,212,261,043.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,164,815,548.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,292,369,608.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,667,811,114.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,468,932,745.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,927,516,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,082,500.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,753,320,710.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,088,559,563.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,382,887,620.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,194,111.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,788,745,754.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,408,701,972.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,567,244,658.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,604,699.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,095,209,451.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,303,596,421.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,936,853,095.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,358,935,928.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,345,212,395.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,446,554,262.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,890,070,466.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,578,595,232.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,930,419,157.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,652,371,460.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,413,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,829,771,467.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,166,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,313,474,733.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,090,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,600,206,105.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,369,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,609,236,615.
 (B) Outlays, \$88,976,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,849,057,844.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,167,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,938,338,847.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,346,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,345,533,818.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,701,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,001,410,265.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,334,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$356,215,596,566.
 (B) Outlays, \$365,098,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,899,454,985.
 (B) Outlays, \$365,047,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,983,956,484.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,881,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,685,568,372.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,491,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,679,065,768.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,281,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,974,828,600.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,016,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,806,363,913.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,895,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,626,231,239.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,693,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,258,019,916.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,340,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,556,573,042.
 (B) Outlays, \$362,722,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,936,390,472.
 (B) Outlays, \$574,877,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$576,281,682,302.
 (B) Outlays, \$576,241,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$635,992,586,992.
 (B) Outlays, \$635,913,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,174,392,195.
 (B) Outlays, \$676,081,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$721,343,299,702.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,248,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$799,902,931,815.
 (B) Outlays, \$799,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$815,174,505,146.
 (B) Outlays, \$814,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$821,746,349,714.
 (B) Outlays, \$821,637,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$914,308,332,995.
 (B) Outlays, \$914,192,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$511,965,047,286.
 (B) Outlays, \$513,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$477,846,923,208.
 (B) Outlays, \$473,264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$477,561,645,878.
 (B) Outlays, \$467,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$474,689,337,990.
 (B) Outlays, \$468,970,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,140,825,023.
 (B) Outlays, \$496,703,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$487,249,815,351.
 (B) Outlays, \$482,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,185,290,642.
 (B) Outlays, \$502,042,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$508,544,506,797.
 (B) Outlays, \$502,891,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$515,858,098,800.
 (B) Outlays, \$504,805,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,835,180,620.
 (B) Outlays, \$525,361,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$166,579,024,441.
 (B) Outlays, \$170,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,542,167,817.
 (B) Outlays, \$164,087,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,507,078,640.
 (B) Outlays, \$161,885,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, 174,058,258,503\$.
 (B) Outlays, \$173,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$178,729,646,992.

(B) Outlays, \$177,778,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$182,762,771,139.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,819,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,775,102,635.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,156,854,593.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$187,957,947,124.
 (B) Outlays, \$186,853,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,405,233,201.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,283,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$47,707,173,265.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,229,224,208.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,772,740,952.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,693,526,677.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,372,110,771.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,732,859,609.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,813,152,904.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,556,175,542.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,466,802,554.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,290,287,822.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,249,674,911.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,787,383,199.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,676,483,435.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,175,876,713.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,454,977,724.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,940,292,949.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,272,247,363.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,740,753,844.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,947,151,651.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,414,282,909.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$364,527,455,629.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,527,455,629.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$410,767,708,539.
 (B) Outlays, \$410,767,708,539.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$469,730,877,172.
 (B) Outlays, \$469,730,877,172.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$517,032,292,681.
 (B) Outlays, \$517,032,292,681.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,654,430,424.
 (B) Outlays, \$557,654,430,424.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,121,216,629.
 (B) Outlays, \$583,121,216,629.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$603,387,733,236.
 (B) Outlays, \$603,387,733,236.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,088,639,892.
 (B) Outlays, \$618,088,639,892.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,301,410,548.
 (B) Outlays, \$623,301,410,548.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,928,755,085.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,928,755,085.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$85,168,180,447.
 (B) Outlays, -\$79,367,705,942.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,768,588,431.
 (B) Outlays, -\$73,377,282,997.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$99,007,336,916.
 (B) Outlays, -\$91,392,129,561.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$107,257,928,704.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,115,606,117.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$120,538,310,875.
 (B) Outlays, -\$112,317,659,215.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$126,001,335,995.
 (B) Outlays, -\$119,487,538,544.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$176,422,893,971.
 (B) Outlays, -\$157,543,531,001.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$148,027,713,468.
 (B) Outlays, -\$134,530,970,997.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$149,789,895,183.
 (B) Outlays, -\$138,129,598,581.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$178,976,219,310.
 (B) Outlays, -\$156,393,874,346.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$73,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$57,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,289,626,954.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,715,564,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,758,382,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,117,067,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF OBAMACARE.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

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

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

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

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

SEC. 204. POLICY STATEMENT ON RECONCILIATION TO REPEAL OBAMACARE.

It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation submissions set forth in section 201 shall fully repeal 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).

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year

2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

SEC. 302. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 303. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(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 enforcing 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 discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

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. 305. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), 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.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 306. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and 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.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN 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 budgetary effects 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 budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, 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 effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), 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. 307. 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 in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 308. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) 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 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, 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. 309. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016

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) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 310. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(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 budgetary 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 207 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) 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.

SEC. 311. 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—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 401. 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 2016 is 6.8 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 2016 is 4.6 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 resolution applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this resolution recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. 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 resolution assumes the repeal of 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, recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on 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 2016 is 5.4 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 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

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

(A) For Medicare, this resolution 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 wors-

ened; 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 resolution calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

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 of 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 REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.

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, 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 2016 through 2025.

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 2016 through 2025.

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 2016 through 2025.

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 2016 through 2025 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

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 2016 through 2025.

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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

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 any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms the Federal transportation funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

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 any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 510. 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.

SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.

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 the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP).

SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.

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 the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 514. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 515. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 516. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

TITLE VI—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 601. 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. 602. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

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

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to

the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law must not only be repealed, but also replaced by enacting the American Health Care Reform Act.

SEC. 603. 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 Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

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

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in 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.

(6) The Medicare eligibility age is gradually increased to keep pace with increases in longevity.

(7) Medicare is simplified by combining parts A and B and reforms to Medigap plans are implemented.

SEC. 604. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID STATE FLEXIBILITY BLOCK GRANTS.

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.

SEC. 605. 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 nearly 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 \$1.7 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) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the "Greenspan Commission" which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for over a generation.

(8) 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 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 these reforms will include the following:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(3) Makes Social Security benefits more progressive over the long term, providing those most in need with a safety net in retirement.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

- (1) encouraging work;
- (2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse; and

(4) enactment of H.R. 918, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time.

SEC. 606. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

(2) 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.

(3) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately \$9.7 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(4) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(5) 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.

(6) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) 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. 607. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **SNAP.**—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(4) In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget is permitted to revise allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels, including discretionary limits, accordingly.

(b) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs.

SEC. 608. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution 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. 609. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 610. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Environmental Protection Agency should be 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. 611. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

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

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities.

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual's job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. 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. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction

creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(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 will 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 helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 612. 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 United States 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) Over the past decade alone, there have been more than 4,400 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. 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 highly complex.

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

(4) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code – a waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(5) 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.

(6) Roughly half of United States 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.

(7) The United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. 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.

(8) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The United States 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.

(9) The "worldwide" structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

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

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

(12) Revenues have averaged about 17.5 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

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

(14) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a "new" source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(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. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that is revenue-neutral on a dynamic basis that provides for the following:

(1) Targets revenue neutrality (relative to CBO's baseline revenue projection) based on a dynamic score that takes into account the macroeconomic effects of reform.

(2) Collapses the current seven brackets for individuals into just two, with a top rate of 25 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code to ensure that fewer Americans will be required to itemize deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer healthcare expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act.

(5) Encourages charitable giving.

(6) Repeals the Death Tax.

(7) Eliminates marriage penalties and encourages families.

(8) Repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax.

(9) Reforms the current Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) that is given in a yearly lump-sum payment and replaces it with a program that would allow workers to exempt a portion of their payroll taxes every month.

(10) Reduces double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to 25 percent and setting a maximum long-term capital gains tax rate at 15 percent.

(11) Sets a maximum dividend tax rate at 15 percent.

(12) Encourages net investment, savings, and entrepreneurial activity.

(13) Moves to a competitive international system of taxation.

(14) Ends distortionary special interest giveaways, such as the Wind Production Tax Credit.

SEC. 613. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

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

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(3) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage.

(4) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a "tax loophole," cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(5) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(6) The status quo of the current tax code undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(7) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to "hollow out" United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for,

key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(8) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system in order to promote job creation in the United States.

SEC. 614. 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. 615. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY.

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

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing our recovery from the economic recession.

(2) In the first two months of 2014 alone, the Administration issued 13,166 pages of regulations imposing more than \$13 billion in compliance costs on job creators and adding more than 16 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(3) The Small Business Administration estimates that the total cost of regulations is as high as \$1.75 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated over \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) resulted in more than \$17 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 58 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the states.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In September 2013, the EPA proposed a rule regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new coal-fired power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants. Additional regulations for existing coal plants are expected in the summer of 2014.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly forty percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto pro-

hibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by Purdue University estimates that electricity prices in Indiana will rise 32 percent by 2023, due in part to EPA regulations.

(10) The Heritage Foundation recently found that a phase out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATION.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) seeks to promote economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) pursues a cost-effective approach to regulation, without sacrificing environmental, health, safety benefits or other benefits, rejecting the premise that economic growth and environmental protection create an either/or proposition;

(3) ensures that regulations do not disproportionately disadvantage low-income Americans through a more rigorous cost-benefit analysis, which also considers who will be most affected by regulations and whether the harm caused is outweighed by the potential harm prevented;

(4) ensures that regulations are subject to an open and transparent process, rely on sound and publicly available scientific data, and that the data relied upon for any particular regulation is provided to Congress immediately upon request;

(5) frees the many commonsense energy and water projects currently trapped in complicated bureaucratic approval processes;

(6) maintains the benefits of landmark environmental, health safety, and other statutes while scaling back this administration's heavy-handed approach to regulation, which has added \$494 billion in mostly ideological regulatory activity since 2009, much of which flies in the face of these statutes' intended purposes; and

(7) seeks to promote a limited government, which will unshackle our economy and create millions of new jobs, providing our Nation with a strong and prosperous future and expanding opportunities for the generations to come.

(8) Requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$50 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective.

SEC. 616. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

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

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

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

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: "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 now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, 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 2017 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 \$5,775 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.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

SEC. 617. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 618. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

SEC. 619. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the “high-risk” list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans’ Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113–146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America’s veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA’s progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

SEC. 620. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED 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 its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could “lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.”

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

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

(C) twenty 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) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage “green building” in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. 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.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) 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.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should 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.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees’ judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

SEC. 621. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

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

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

SEC. 622. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(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 canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees should

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 continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 623. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

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

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—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.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 624. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.

It is the policy of this resolution 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. 625. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its "power of the purse", and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater

amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way, consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to "pay for" merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and "reforms" enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress's "power of the purse", and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(8) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(9) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(10) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control

Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

SEC. 626. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.

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

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The "accrual method" of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the "cash method" records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 627. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

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

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT.—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 628. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget

authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

SEC. 629. NO BUDGET, NO PAY.

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Blueprint for a Balanced Budget, the Republican Study Committee's substitute amendment that will expand opportunities for middle class families, grow our economy, and strengthen our national defense.

First of all, I want to say I appreciate Chairman PRICE and his hard work on the budget that is being presented from the Republican Conference, and I am looking forward to the continued debate as we make sure that we look forward to strengthening our economy and America.

Mr. Chairman, it is very clear we are on the wrong path. Despite improving indicators, folks across the country know that our economic recovery has been sluggish at best. Over 90 million Americans are not participating in the workforce, wages are stagnant, and businesses are struggling with the uncertainty about what new tax or regulation is waiting for them just around the corner.

No matter how many stimulus packages, shovel-ready jobs, and summer recoveries the President promises, things aren't getting better fast enough. Unfortunately, on many fronts the fundamentals are getting worse.

Since President Obama took office, our national debt has increased by 70 percent and has now soared past \$18 trillion. To make matters worse, the President's recently proposed budget calls for even more taxes and even more spending, and never, ever balances.

Fortunately, we now have a choice. We can continue down the road President Obama wants us to with a reckless tax and spend agenda that will add \$8.5 trillion to our debt and does nothing

to reform our soon-to-be bankrupt social safety nets, or we can decide to make the bold and necessary decisions our constituents sent us here to make.

With the Republican Study Committee's blueprint, we can fix our broken system, and we can build a better future for the American people. We do this by addressing our Nation's challenges head on.

First, it is clear we must change Washington's out-of-control spending habits. If we don't, by 2023, we could be spending more money paying off the interest on our debt than we do on our national defense.

I would like to show you a chart, Mr. Chairman. As you can see, under the President's plan, because of the addiction to borrowing, our Federal Government continues to rack up more interest payments year after year. Keep in mind, this is money that we have to pay as a Federal Government, that we cannot go to a line item and say, We are going to cut that particular payment. We have to pay the interest on our debt. This is locked in due to our borrowing.

In fact, under CBO's projections, if our interest rates on government notes increase by just 1 percent for 10 years, this expense could go up by a whopping \$1.75 trillion.

I would like to show this in particular. Last year, in the 10-year window, this particular bar is \$785 billion alone, much more than what our defense spending would cost.

We have to act, and with the RSC blueprint we do. Our budget cuts \$7.1 trillion in Federal spending over the next decade and balances the budget in 6 years. The only way we are going to ever start paying our debt is if we get to a balanced budget.

By enacting commonsense reforms, we are able to have a surplus. By year 2021, we will have a surplus so we can start paying that debt down. If you look at the President's budget, you will never, ever see a balanced budget, and so we will never, ever deal with our debt.

In addition, our budget puts forward a pro-growth set of tax reforms that will make the Tax Code simpler, fairer, and more competitive. We do this by lowering rates and simplifying brackets. We reduce taxes on small businesses and corporations, and we encourage money that is setting overseas to return home by transitioning to a fairer, smarter territorial tax system.

To get the government out of one-sixth of America's economy, through reconciliation, our plan repeals ObamaCare in full. However, we replace it. We replace the failed law with the American Health Care Reform Act, a patient-centered, free market, and affordable way to provide health care for all Americans. This act allows individuals and families to deduct health care costs, expands access to health savings accounts, and creates options and choices for Americans to purchase their coverage across State lines.

Our budget also strengthens national defense. Our Federal Government's primary role, number one constitutional responsibility, is the defense of the Nation. By providing our men and women in uniform with \$570 billion in our base defense budget, we are able to ensure our military has the resources it needs to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, in 1962, discretionary programs made up a majority of government spending. Today, it is the reverse. So-called mandatory programs, like we see right here, are on autopilot, and this makes up two-thirds of the budget. As you can see, these programs are on a clock. We can see that Social Security Disability Insurance goes bankrupt in 2016. Social Security retirement for Americans all across the country goes bankrupt in 2034. And, of course, Medicare isn't too far behind that; it is actually in front of Social Security, and goes bankrupt in 2030.

The clock is ticking, Mr. Chairman, and we need to do something sooner rather than later. This is very predictable and it is very preventable if we act now. The President doesn't do that. In contrast, our plan does, and it makes the critical structural reforms necessary to preserve these entitlement programs for current and future seniors.

Let's not let the solvable problems of today become the causes of decline tomorrow. Let's stand together and let's pass a serious budget through a serious conversation that reforms the way Washington operates. Let's pass a budget that will allow opportunities for middle class families to flourish. Let's pass a budget that will keep America strong for years to come at home and abroad.

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

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, we debated the Republican budget proposal as it came to the floor. We saw that even as Americans are working even harder every day, their budget would squeeze them more. It would squeeze middle class families and those working to join the middle class. It would squeeze students trying to get an affordable college education. It would squeeze seniors by immediately increasing the cost of prescription drugs, immediately increasing the cost of copays for preventive health services.

This budget on the floor today squeezes those families even harder, even as both budgets provide another round of windfall tax cuts to the folks at the very top by cutting the top tax rate by over a third as they green light the Romney-Ryan plan.

This particular budget actually will slow down economic growth over the

next couple of years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Those are the nonpartisan professionals that analyze these budgets. They looked at the Republican budget and said: You know, it will slow down growth in the next couple of years.

This particular version of the Republican budget will do so even more. Why would we want to slow down economic growth just as the trends are picking up? Look, we have got a long way to go to get everybody back to work, but we are on the right path, on the right trajectory. Why would we want to put on the brakes, as the Republican budget does, as well as the RSC budget, in the coming years?

While the Republican budget we had on the floor just the other day has no answer, no immediate answer to the pending shortfall in the transportation trust fund, this particular budget unreservedly just divests the Federal Government of responsibility for most highways and transit projects that are currently supported by the Federal budget.

I will say in closing that there is one redeeming quality to this budget, which is that this budget does not play games with the overseas contingency accounts, like the Republican budget brought to the floor by the chairman does. This does not use the so-called "overseas contingency account" as a slush fund. This budget funds defense in the same straightforward way that the President of the United States' budget does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to just mention that CBO is actually projecting that our economic growth is going to slow down. That is happening under this administration's policies, and it is not helping Americans recover as quickly as possible. This is a serious budget that does deal with those challenges, and it is straightforward. We believe we have to get to a balanced budget sooner rather than later so we can have a stronger economy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), chairman of the RSC.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Republican Study Committee budget for fiscal year 2016.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for the great work that he has done in crafting the blueprint for a balanced budget, a robust and responsible plan to tackle \$18 trillion of national debt, along with the over \$100 trillion of unfunded obligations, which are crippling the futures of millions of hard-working Americans, their children, and their grandchildren.

I also want to thank Chairman PRICE and the Budget Committee for their great work on the Conference budget. But today, I am proud to support the budget proposal put forth by the Republican Study Committee.

The RSC budget will balance the Federal budget in just 6 years, providing a

better future for our children and our grandchildren. It also reduces rampant government overspending by \$7.1 trillion compared to current policy, and it gets rid of redundant and unconstitutional government programs that waste billions of precious taxpayer dollars.

Hard-working American families know the importance of prioritizing to live within their means, and it is time the Federal Government learned that lesson as well.

This budget upholds the Congress' sacred constitutional duty to first provide for our national defense. Maintaining a strong military must be Congress' number one priority, especially in this increasingly dangerous world.

Our budget follows Ronald Reagan's successful strategy of "peace through strength" for our national security.

Defense spending should be determined first and foremost by our security needs, capabilities, and the threats facing our Nation. Acknowledging that, this plan allocates \$570 billion in base defense spending for fiscal year 2016 and provides for a total of \$6.4 trillion in defense spending over the next decade.

We also believe that we must work to grow America's economy, not Washington's bureaucracy. The best way that we can spur growth and encourage job creation is by getting the government out of the way of America's innovators and entrepreneurs. This means repealing ObamaCare through reconciliation and establishing patient-centered reforms for better American health care.

The RSC budget also calls for replacing the current Tax Code with a new pro-growth Tax Code that will benefit all taxpayers and families. We need a simpler, fairer, more competitive Tax Code that will help, not hinder, America's opportunity economy. We also sunset the IRS and we end the death tax.

Finally, this budget addresses the dire state of America's social safety net programs and puts them back on a path toward solvency and toward doing the right thing for America's families.

Unless Congress acts, Medicare will be bankrupt by 2013, Social Security retirement will be bankrupt by 2033, and Social Security Disability Insurance will be bankrupt next year, in 2016.

This budget introduces new reforms that strengthen America's social safety net so that it will be here for future generations. And we structure them in such a way to keep families together and to provide ladders of opportunity out of poverty. We don't keep people trapped in poverty.

We in Congress have an obligation to the American people to live within our means and to be trustworthy stewards of taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, Washington has fallen short.

Voting "yes" on the RSC budget is an opportunity for this Congress to restore the trust of the American people and to show that we are carrying out

the important job that they sent us here to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on the RSC budget and “yes” again on the House Budget Committee budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

□ 1500

Ms. MOORE. Let me thank the ranking member and my colleagues on the other side for the tremendous effort and work that they have put into this budget.

Mr. Chair, of course, I am opposed to the Republican Study Committee budget. This is the committee adopted budget on steroids. The Republican Study Committee, to kind of outdo their Republican counterparts, balances this budget in 6 years instead of 10, and it cuts it by \$7.1 trillion in just 6 years.

I can tell you, while I am opposed to this budget, I have to commend the Republican Study Committee for putting it on the table here in a very transparent manner. Rather than raising the defense budget by \$9 billion above the President’s budget and putting all of those funds into the OCO account, at least they end the sequester and do it in a transparent, budgetary way. I commend them for that, but I do urge my colleagues to reject this budget.

This budget raises taxes on the middle class. It divests in education for our students. It divests in infrastructure improvements for our roads, for our ports, for our bridges. There is much to be said for balancing a budget, but you not only can’t do it on the backs of the poor, the elderly, the infirm, and children, but on the back of the economy.

I am also on the Financial Services Committee, and we have been warned that growing inequality is not only bad for morale in our country, but it will destroy our economy in the long run.

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

I will just point out really quickly that I appreciate the other side’s compliments on how we budget for defense, but let’s remember this, that defense is only 18 percent of the overall Federal Government spending.

As you see on this pie chart, this is defense discretionary spending right here, \$596 billion. This is nondefense discretionary spending. The rest of this pie, which is the rest of the \$3.5 trillion in Federal Government spending, is untouched. It is on autopilot. Here is the interest. All of these programs continue to grow.

If we don’t protect these programs and reform them, this is only going to get squeezed more and more. If we want to protect the country, we have to recognize that we are going to have to do it in a way that puts our priorities in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBERG).

Mr. PITTEMBERG. Thank you, Congressman STUTZMAN, for yielding me this time and for your hard work and leadership on the RSC’s budget task force. Thank you, also, to Chairman FLORES for his great leadership.

Mr. Chairman, America’s national debt is now well over \$18 trillion. Because of out-of-control spending, we add another \$1 billion to the debt approximately every 30 seconds. The Republican Study Committee’s Blueprint for a Balanced Budget takes important steps to rein in our bloated bureaucracy, cuts unnecessary regulations, and strengthens job creation while it increases transparency and oversight.

Here is our budget proposal. It cuts \$7.1 trillion in spending over 10 years. It balances the Federal budget in 6 years. Imagine that.

It repeals ObamaCare and replaces it with competitive reforms that will lower costs for all Americans while protecting the relationship between the patient and his doctor. It preserves Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamps through commonsense reforms that bring these programs into the 21st century. It also addresses inadequacies in President Obama’s budget by providing critical funding for our national security.

Since I have started speaking, Mr. Chairman, we have added \$2 billion to the national debt. That is insanity. Our Founding Fathers never intended for Washington to provide massive, one-size-fits-all programs that will not create better opportunities for hard-working, tax-paying Americans. As well, we need to return control back to the States, where local leaders know the best solutions for their local problems.

As a member of the RSC’s budget task force, I am honored to place the priorities of North Carolinians ahead of Washington’s tax-and-spend schemes. Please join me in supporting the RSC’s Blueprint for a Balanced Budget, which will restore fiscally accountable principles to our Federal Government and better opportunities for the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, about the only thing any of the Republican budgets have done in recent years is to cut the deficit, ignoring altogether the desperate needs and declining wages of the people.

This year, the American people will give Congress no credit for a budget that does not grow jobs and good wages. The Republican budget cuts growth by 2.5 percent, and it devastates almost 3 million jobs.

Instead of using a readymade need in order to grow good jobs with good

wages—the surface transportation bill that must be authorized this year—the Republican budget would, for the first time in our history, cut almost all new highway and transit funding. States would be left able to fill potholes but unable to begin a single new project.

Infrastructure needs must be met at some point anyway, so we do ourselves no favor by our serial failure to meet the needs that also have been shown to be the best way to fuel the economy with good jobs.

There is no magical way to cut our way into good jobs and begin to repair income inequality. The old-fashioned, American way of building America’s neglected infrastructure is the best way today, as it was when President Eisenhower initiated the surface transportation bill 70 years ago.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget.

It is a conservative, pro-growth document that balances in 6 years, that repeals ObamaCare and replaces it with a patient-centered solution, that stops the President’s lawless executive amnesty, and that simplifies the Tax Code. The budget also offers commonsense reforms to strengthen America’s entitlement programs.

The RSC budget accomplishes all of this while still fully funding our national security commitments by providing \$570 billion in base defense spending, not through budget gimmicks. In a time of weak and uncertain White House leadership on national security, bad actors are given incentive to be more aggressive. We must not underfund our military at this time.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the RSC budget and return America to a position of fiscal strength and stability.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a wonderful member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, we are debating the Federal budget at a time when America is experiencing an economic recovery—unemployment is down; gas prices are lower, and retirement accounts are healthier—yet that is at risk if the Republican budget is adopted.

It would weaken America’s recovery. How? The Republican budget turns its back on what makes America grow and on what makes America strong, including our students, medical and scientific research, and modern transportation systems and infrastructure.

Democrats will offer a more optimistic vision for America that builds on our economic recovery. Democrats want everyone to succeed while Republicans shower tax breaks on the wealthy at the expense of hard-working families.

The people I know and meet work hard every day. They value good jobs, good schools, safe communities, and the promise of, when they retire, that they can live their retirement years in dignity.

The Republican budget is not one for the hard-working people of America. The Republican budget is crafted by the special interests for the special interests. Republicans stack the deck against working families and small businesses. They refuse to find one tax loophole to close or change. If you are incredibly rich, then you are incredibly lucky because this Republican budget is for you; you pay less.

If you are like the vast majority of Americans, hold on because you are going to pay more. If you are a student who wants to attend college, Republicans make it harder by cutting Pell grants and student loans. If you have a job in transportation, infrastructure, or at a port or at an airport, the Republican budget could cost you your job. It will, at the very least, put us farther behind.

If you believe that America should remain the world leader in medical research and innovation, sorry, as the Republican budget slashes research at the National Institutes of Health, at our universities, and at research institutions.

If you are an older American, the Republicans ask you to pay much more for Medicare and long-term care. Republicans take away that secure lifeline that has existed for decades since the Democratic Congress passed Medicare and Medicaid.

In doing so, the Republicans break the promise to older Americans that, after working hard all of your life, you can live your retirement years in dignity, without the fear of poverty in your old age; you will pay more.

The Republican budget is a cynical, special interest driven vision of America. In contrast, the Democratic budget invests in what makes America great and in what makes America strong.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. One noted economist recently advised that America has the strongest economy in the developed world right now, but the Republican budget puts that at risk in order to boost a special few.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic plan and what makes America great: a growing, healthy economy; our students; scientific research; modern infrastructure in America; and the great promise of our country.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, the great ranking member and leader of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Chairman, when I took this office, I vowed to work in a bipartisan fashion, and I am committed to doing that. I have been pleasantly surprised at how many Republicans are willing—even eager—to work across party lines. Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Republican budget before us today.

The Republican budget not only fails to grow our economy, but it deprives many Americans of the resources and support they need to succeed. A budget is a value statement, and it is clear that what the Republicans are proposing today is bad for our working families, for our students, and for our veterans.

I was proud to offer two amendments last week during the House Budget Committee markup, addressing issues that should have broad bipartisan support: our veterans and our students. Unbelievably, my Republican colleagues voted against funding to protect the VA from future government shutdowns and to provide more financial support to help students get the vocational training they need to succeed in a 21st century workplace.

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

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, no budget is ever perfect, but the Democratic resolution invests the most in our future by placing American families, students, and military service-members first.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. STUTZMAN. Yes.

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

As I said in my comments earlier, this budget suffers from all of the problems that the earlier Republican budget suffered from, but it does have one redeeming quality, which is that it does not use the overseas contingency account as a slush fund. It actually funds defense in a straightforward manner.

In listening to the advocates of this budget, I thought maybe their accounting had been more sound on other fronts, but as I look at it—I look at the Republican budget and how much revenue it raises over 10 years, and I look

at the Republican study group's budget, which has the identical amount of revenue over 10 years—what that means is that we see the same budget quackery in claiming to balance because that revenue includes revenue from the Affordable Care Act, almost \$1 trillion worth.

□ 1515

It includes the savings from the Affordable Care Act, which both Republican budgets claim to repeal.

You know what it doesn't include? It does not include the costs of all the tax bills that are coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means, including one being marked up today which would entirely get rid of the estate tax, meaning that it will benefit 5,500 people in this country at the cost of \$269 billion a year. Seventy-five percent of this tax break is going to go to the inheritors of estates valued at more than \$20 million. You add that to this budget, and it is even more out of balance.

But it does point to the underlying theme in all the Republican budgets, which is let's give another tax break to the very wealthiest in this country; right? Let's cut the top rate for millionaires while we squeeze middle class families and those working their way into the middle class. They are going to increase the tax burden on them.

The chairman of the committee, I think he went to Emory University. I think they have got about 5,500 students, maybe a little bit more undergraduate. This would provide almost \$269 billion to a population of 5,500 households in the country—the folks at the very top—while they are cutting our investment in our kids' education dramatically, while they are cutting our investment in innovation and research that has helped power our economy, while they are devolving most of our transportation system away from the Federal Government, even though our Federal transportation system has helped power our economy and make us competitive in this very competitive world.

So from the budget gimmicks that apparently are the same in both budgets to the fact that both budgets say to folks at the very top: You know what? We are going to give you another tax break while we squeeze everybody else in America; right?

They increase the costs of student loans. You have got over a trillion dollars in student debt. Why would we be increasing the cost of student loans? They are going to start charging students interest while they are in college.

They are going to require seniors on Medicare to immediately pay more for prescription drugs by reopening the doughnut hole.

So hard-working families, students trying to go to college, seniors who are trying to have a secure retirement, they all get hit on the same day that they provide a huge tax break to 5,500 people. That says it all about what

both these Republican budgets do. They disinvest in our future; they squeeze hard-working families, students, and seniors, while saying to the folks who are already at the top of the ladder: We are going to give you just one more break. And go ahead and pull up that ladder of opportunity behind you; it doesn't matter. We are going to leave everybody else behind.

That is not what America stands for. I thought this was the land of opportunity. But while they cut our investment in education, they don't cut a single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, and then they go and claim a balance that is phony.

Mr. Chairman, I ask everyone to reject both these Republican budgets. They are wrong for the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would first of all just like to thank the RNC members for helping to put this budget together. It is a blueprint for a balanced budget. There are no gimmicks.

What the gentleman is referring to is our revenue line highlights the benefit that Americans receive when we have tax reform. For example, you know, the gimmick that was sold in the health care law was that people were going to pay less in health care costs. I was at a Cracker Barrel a couple of weeks ago in Auburn in my district, and a lady comes up to me and says: Mr. Congressman, I would like to show you my story. I am now paying more in premiums. My premiums doubled. My out-of-pocket expense went from \$500 to \$5,000.

That is more than a tax increase, Mr. Chairman.

Our foreign policy is on the wrong path; our spending is on the wrong path; our economy is on the wrong path. We have got to get back to priorities and recognize, for our country to be strong economically, to be strong with our defense, that we have got to get our budget back into balance to make sure that we can pay off the \$18 trillion of debt that our kids have to face. I have two boys, Payton and Preston, 13 and 9 years old. They are going to have to pay the interest on this debt and the debt for years and years to come.

I ask the Members of this body to take a serious look at the RNC budget, and I ask for their support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

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 to reform the tax system to work for hard working Americans.
- Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the extension of expired or expiring tax provisions.
- Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.
- Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicaid and children's health improvement.
- Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
- Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability and completion.
- Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a competitive workforce.
- Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and service members.
- Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for modernizing unemployment compensation.
- Sec. 211. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.
- Sec. 212. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
- Sec. 213. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.
- Sec. 214. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- Sec. 215. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the health care workforce.
- Sec. 216. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving the availability of long-term care services and supports.

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 STATEMENTS

- Sec. 501. Policy of the House on job creation.
- Sec. 502. Policy of the House on surface transportation.
- Sec. 503. Policy of the House on tax reform that works for hardworking families.
- Sec. 504. Policy of the House on building ladders of opportunity to help hardworking families join the middle class.
- Sec. 505. Policy of the House on women's economic empowerment, and health and safety improvement.
- Sec. 506. Policy of the House on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 507. Policy of the House on the Federal workforce.
- Sec. 508. Policy of the House on a national strategy to eradicate poverty and increase opportunity.
- Sec. 509. Policy of the House on rejecting the sequester.
- Sec. 510. Policy of the House on Social Security.
- Sec. 511. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
- Sec. 512. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
- Sec. 513. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
- Sec. 514. Policy of the House on investments that help children succeed.
- Sec. 515. Policy of the House on immigration reform.
- Sec. 516. Policy of the House on national security.
- Sec. 517. Policy of the House on climate change science.
- Sec. 518. Policy of the House on financial consumer protection.
- Sec. 519. Policy of the House on the use of taxpayer funds.
- Sec. 520. 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 2015 through 2025:

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

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

- Fiscal year 2015: \$2,439,277,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$2,775,502,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,882,276,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$2,989,720,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,114,729,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,251,847,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,398,020,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,561,491,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$3,783,024,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$4,010,679,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$4,426,906,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2015: \$11,000,000,000
- Fiscal year 2016: \$99,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$106,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$120,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$132,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$144,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$150,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$168,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$228,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$286,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$341,000,000,000.

(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 2015: \$2,961,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,211,302,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,292,123,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,468,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,650,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,828,418,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,993,651,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,162,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,357,628,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,550,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$4,725,021,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,941,778,000,000
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,165,536,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,288,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,422,685,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,603,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,776,636,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,947,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,138,897,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,318,454,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,497,245,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$4,685,225,000,000.

(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 2015: -\$502,501,000,000
 Fiscal year 2016: -\$390,034,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$406,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$432,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$488,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$524,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$549,227,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$577,406,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$535,430,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$486,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$438,319,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$18,468,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$19,032,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,667,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$20,347,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,074,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,836,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,625,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,426,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,206,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,963,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,659,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$13,360,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2016: \$13,815,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,302,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,828,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,433,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,099,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,818,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,597,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,373,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,143,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,915,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$596,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$590,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$570,380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$582,430,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,126,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,904,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$593,364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,837,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,639,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$588,174,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$597,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,245,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$606,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,525,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$622,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$645,784,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$630,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$659,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$638,461,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$672,414,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$655,940,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,611,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,492,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,862,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,904,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,779,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,193,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,467,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,904,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,555,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,595,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,166,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,805,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,948,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,619,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,279,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,658,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,667,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,933,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,587,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,559,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,491,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,512,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,641,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,937,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,966,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,484,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,102,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,652,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,173,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,239,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,024,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,593,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,685,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,638,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,611,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,935,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,510,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,133,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,898,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,821,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,222,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,856,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,038,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,384,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,024,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,162,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,075,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,525,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,145,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,168,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,483,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$17,323,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$29,458,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,582,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$730,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,487,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,994,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,656,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$406,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,460,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,341,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,736,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,569,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,236,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,892,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$108,674,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,765,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$109,913,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$102,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,563,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$114,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,377,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,359,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$106,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$106,234,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$106,058,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,012,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$106,517,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,511,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,794,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,677,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,694,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,894,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,758,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,687,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,858,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,708,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,659,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,922,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,979,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,248,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$107,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,660,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$121,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,742,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$127,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$134,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$130,666,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$139,874,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$136,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,897,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$140,745,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$144,868,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,609,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$148,664,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$152,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$154,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$155,116,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$487,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$481,126,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$515,793,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$529,317,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$565,428,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$567,738,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,501,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$592,459,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$616,322,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$617,964,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$647,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$638,478,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$667,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$701,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$700,370,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$734,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,075,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$770,027,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$769,587,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,404,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$806,360,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$539,669,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$539,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$581,608,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$584,052,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$588,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$588,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$656,892,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$656,696,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$704,939,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$704,788,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$756,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$756,741,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$854,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$854,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$877,624,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$876,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$890,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$889,628,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$986,230,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$990,740,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,580,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$512,007,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$539,209,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$533,999,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$548,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$542,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$553,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$543,191,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$567,378,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$587,465,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,673,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$594,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$621,724,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,430,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,671,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$626,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$632,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,486,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$659,847,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,079,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$155,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$168,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$172,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$172,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$166,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$177,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$177,528,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$182,113,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$185,682,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$185,175,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$196,926,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$193,729,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$190,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,340,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$203,439,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,706,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,043,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,250,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,350,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,804,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,253,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,227,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,498,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,823,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,787,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,291,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,767,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,525,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,336,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,806,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,007,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,819,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,541,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,842,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,971,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,428,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,788,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,299,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$325,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$325,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$368,173,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,173,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$420,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$493,610,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$493,610,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$559,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$559,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$622,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$622,059,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$672,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$672,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$723,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$723,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$773,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$773,014,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$815,026,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$815,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$847,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$847,334,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$21,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$36,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,059,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,661,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,925,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,058,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$8,030,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$665,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,028,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$52,729,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$53,206,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,572,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,680,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,833,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,813,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$106,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$106,825,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,012,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$78,012,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,978,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,978,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-
 al War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,085,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,000,000.

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, non-profits, 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 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE TAX SYSTEM TO WORK FOR HARD WORKING AMERICANS.

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 reforms the tax system to reward American workers, incentivize higher pay, and increase the after-tax take home income of working families, such as paycheck tax credits for American workers; incentives for workers to save a portion of their income; incentives for corporations to raise employee pay and/or provide employees with ownership and profit-sharing opportunities; incentives for investments in apprenticeships and other training programs that result in higher skills and better pay; provide tax relief to offset the additional and unique costs faced by two-earner families; a modernized and expanded Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit; or other reforms to the tax system to make it work for the middle class and those working to join the middle class, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE EXTENSION OF EXPIRED OR EXPIRING TAX 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 provisions of the tax code that have

expired or will expire in the future, including tax incentives for research and development, renewable energy investments, charitable giving, economic and community development, and tax relief for working families and small businesses, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

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

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

- (1) new incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;
- (2) payment accuracy improvements to encourage efficient use of resources;
- (3) innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings;
- (4) policies to hold providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care;
- (5) improvements to Medicare's benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicare, including improvements to programs that provide assistance with premiums and cost-sharing to beneficiaries with limited incomes; and
- (6) extension of expiring provisions;

excluding any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes any changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH 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 improves Medicaid or other children's health programs, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025. Such improvements may include—

- (1) restoring the enhanced Medicaid reimbursement rates for certain primary care services to Medicare levels using Federal funds, and expanding the enhanced rates to rates to additional health care providers;
- (2) providing States with tools to streamline enrollment into Medicaid and CHIP and ensure continuity of care, and may include permanently extending the Express Lane Eligibility option for children or creating an option to provide 12-month continuous eligibility for adults in Medicaid; and
- (3) providing more options for States to expand access to home and community based long-term care services for seniors and persons with disabilities, and to improve benefits.

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

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

provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025. Improvements may include any of the following:

- (1) Changes to foster care to expand the number of at-risk children for whom effective supportive, prevention, and post-permanency services are provided to promote safety, well-being, and permanency for vulnerable children.
- (2) Changes to encourage increased parental support for children, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child and policies that 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.
- (3) Regular increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.
- (4) Funding for research designed to improve program effectiveness in creating positive outcomes for low-income children and families.

SEC. 207. 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: encourage States and higher education institutions to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students; ensure continued full funding for Pell grants; or help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE.

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 helps ensure that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs, including: fully reauthorizing the Trade Adjustment Assistance program; funding proven effective job training and employment programs, such as year-round and summer jobs for youth; or new initiatives such as apprenticeships involving collaborations between employers, educators, and providers and job training services, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

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) improves access and enhances the delivery of timely health care to the Nation's veterans and service members;

(2) improves the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increasing the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(3) makes improvements to the Post 9/11 GI Bill to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

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

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

(6) 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 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MODERNIZING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

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 modernizes unemployment compensation, including providing additional learning opportunities and training for unemployed workers, expanding program eligibility to more workers, or making the program more responsive to economic downturns, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 211. 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 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION 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 provides full funding for the Land and Water Conservation 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 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 213. 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 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 214. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING 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 provides additional funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund beyond the base levels provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 215. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE HEALTH CARE WORKFORCE.

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 contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 216. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING THE AVAILABILITY OF LONG-TERM CARE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS.

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 availability of long-term care services and supports for senior citizens and individuals with disabilities, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2025. Such improvements may include creation of a comprehensive long-term care insurance program; pilot programs or studies to determine the best options for improving access to long-term care services; or other improvements to Medicare, Medicaid, or other programs to provide increased access to long-term care.

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 2016 is 6.8 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 2015 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending: The resolution rejects cuts to the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty. It assumes extension of the tax credits from the American Taxpayer Relief Act due to expire at the end of 2017. These credits include an increase in refundability of the child tax credit, relief for married earned income tax credit filers, and a larger earned income tax credit for larger families. It also assumes expansion of the earned income tax credit for childless workers, a group that has seen limited support from safety net programs, and other impacts of a middle class and pro-work tax reform.

(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 2016 is 5.4 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 2015 is 5.5 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. In other areas, the resolution assumes additional funding for child care, early education, and children's health; extension and expansion of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which assists with higher education expenses; and funding certain tribal support costs that have been previously annually appropriated. It also would create a National Infrastructure Bank, an Apprenticeship Training Fund, and a Paid Leave Partnership Initiative, which would help States establish paid leave programs. The resolution repeals the mandatory sequester required under the Budget Control Act.

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 2017 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 2018, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(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 2016 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2016.

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 2016 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 2016.

(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 2016 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 2016.

(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 2016 that appropriates \$9,572,000,000 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 \$667,000,000, 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 2016.

(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 2016 that appropriates \$151,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$30,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, 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 2016.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, 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.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for Overseas Contingency Operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority specified in section 102(21).

(2) LIMITATION.—Adjustments made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall only include funding appropriated to the Overseas Contingency Operations title of an appropriations bill for war activities and related diplomatic and development operations, or for activities related to countering urgent national security threats, and shall not include funding for regular, base budget activities.

(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, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.—

(1) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed \$1.5 billion for wildfire suppression 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 additional amount of budget authority above the base amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, 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), (c), and (d) 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 114th 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 STATEMENTS

SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOB CREATION.

(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 nearly 800,000 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 12 million private jobs over the past 60 consecutive months;

(3) United States manufacturing has shared in this recovery with manufacturing employment having grown over the last five years, the first such extended period of growth since the 1990s;

(4) 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;

(5) millions of Americans remain unemployed or underemployed, in danger of seeing a middle-class lifestyle slip away or remain out of reach, and this issue is especially acute in the African-American and Latino communities, making it imperative that we push for extended job creation which is broadly-shared; and

(6) further job creation is vital to ensure that the economy continues to recover and that the benefits of the recovery are more broadly shared.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should make it a priority to enact legislation to help create jobs in the United States, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the United States.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) supports funding for President Obama's six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal;

(B) supports efforts for additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements, such as a National Infrastructure Bank that can be used for a wide range of infrastructure investments, including investments in expanding clean energy production and energy efficiency, and support for biomedical and other research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals;

(C) protects jobs in the United States by eliminating unjustified corporate tax breaks that encourage firms to ship jobs and capital overseas and shelter their profits in foreign tax havens, including provisions that permit U.S. companies to "invert" and pretend to move overseas purely to reduce taxes—revenues raised by the elimination or reduction of such tax breaks can then be invested in infrastructure improvements and other job creation efforts; and

(D) supports a "Make it in America" agenda that seeks to expand on the recent recovery in manufacturing jobs and help encourage a resurgence of manufacturing in the United States through job creation measures, including the development of new domestic manufacturing institutes to conduct research into innovative products and materials, the establishment of a new investment fund of up to \$10 billion to help American-made advanced manufacturing technologies reach commercial scale production, and passage of other legislation to support manufacturing in the United States.

SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

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

(1) Supporting the President's six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization investment will sharpen America's global competitive edge in the 21st century by allowing infrastructure expansion and modernization.

(2) Many of our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair, and fail to move as many goods and people as the economy demands. The American Society of Engineers gives the United States infrastructure an overall grade of D+.

(3) Deep cuts to our transportation funding over the next 10 years will hurt families and businesses at a time when we have major infrastructure needs and workers ready to do the job.

(4) Increasing transportation investments improves our quality of life by building new ladders of opportunity—improving our competitive edge, facilitating American exports, creating new jobs and increasing access to existing ones, and fostering economic growth, while also providing critical safety improvements and reduced commute times.

(5) The highway trust fund provides critical funding for repairing, expanding, and modernizing roads, bridges, and transit systems, and according to recent CBO projections, it is expected to become insolvent this summer. This could force a halt to construction projects, which would put hundreds of thousands of jobs at risk.

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to provide funding in support of the President's proposed six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization that prevents the

imminent insolvency of the highway trust fund and increases investment in our highway and transit programs. Such an investment sharpens our competitive edge, increases access to jobs, reduces commute times, makes our highways and transit systems safer, facilitates American exports, creates jobs, and fosters economic growth.

SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM THAT WORKS FOR HARD-WORKING FAMILIES.

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

(1) Americans today are working harder than ever, but their paychecks are flat.

(2) American families lost economic ground during the 2000s and the Great Recession. U.S. Census data shows that median household income fell 8.6 percent in real terms between 2000 and 2013, and is still no higher than it was in 1989.

(3) Studies by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and Standard and Poor's, among others, have concluded that increased income inequality is a threat to economic growth.

(4) American workers are getting a smaller share of the growing economic pie. For the period 1948-1973, labor productivity increased 97 percent, and real hourly compensation for workers increased at a similar rate: 91 percent. But from 1973-2013, productivity rose by 146 percent and workers' compensation rose by only 18 percent.

(5) Since the 1970s, economic gains have gone overwhelmingly to the highest-income Americans, while the middle class and most other hard working Americans have been left behind. According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1979 and 2011, after-tax incomes rose five times as fast for the top one percent of households, whose annual incomes average more than \$1 million, than they did for the middle 60 percent of Americans.

(6) The tax code treats income from wealth more favorably than income from work by giving preferential tax rates on unearned income, and contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(7) The top one percent of households receives a disproportionate share—17 percent—of the benefit of major tax expenditures, according to the Congressional Budget Office. These preferences have exacerbated income and wealth inequality.

(8) Past Republican tax plans have made reducing taxes for the wealthiest Americans the top priority. Republicans also would repeal Affordable Care Act tax credits which help millions of families buy affordable health insurance, abandon important expansions to the Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit, and cut higher education benefits by allowing the American Opportunity Tax Credit to expire. The result has been legislation that increased deficits while giving a disproportionate share of any tax cuts to the wealthy. Such a tax increase would—

(A) make it even harder for working families to make ends meet;

(B) cost the economy millions of jobs over the coming years by reducing consumer spending, which will greatly weaken economic growth; and

(C) further widen the income gap between the wealthiest households and the middle class by making the tax code more regressive.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution to reform the tax code to work for hard working Americans, to cut special interest tax breaks for the top one percent, and to close unproductive special interest corporate tax breaks and loopholes, without increasing the tax burden on middle-class taxpayers.

SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON BUILDING LADDERS OF OPPORTUNITY TO HELP HARDWORKING FAMILIES JOIN THE MIDDLE CLASS.

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

(1) Even as the economy grows, wage stagnation and income inequality persist, requiring additional ladders of opportunity to help hard-working families join the middle class.

(2) Young adults with a college degree are much more likely to be employed than those with just a high school diploma. In 2013, the unemployment rate for young college graduates was 7 percent versus 17 percent for those with only a high school degree, but the difference was even bigger during the economic downturn.

(3) More than 8 million low-income students each year rely on Federal Pell grants to help pay for college. Pell grants are well-targeted; more than 73 percent of Pell grant recipients have family incomes of less than \$30,000 per year. More than 10 million college students also rely on the American Opportunity Tax Credit to help defray the cost of college, but that tax credit expires at the end of 2017.

(4) As college costs have continued to rise, total student loan debt has quadrupled over the past ten years to more than \$1.3 trillion. More than 80 percent of that debt is from Federal student loans. In 2013, more than two thirds of those graduating from college had student loan debt, and the average debt had grown to \$28,400.

(5) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credit (CTC) encourage work and are some of our most effective anti-poverty programs, and they have generally enjoyed strong, bipartisan support from Members of Congress and Presidents of each party.

(6) Enhancements to the EITC and CTC enacted in 2009 lifted 1.6 million people out of poverty, including nearly one million children. Many military families are among the beneficiaries of these vital policies.

(7) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(8) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country – including more than 13 million working women – are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(9) Nearly one-quarter of adults in the United States report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child or relative, and 87 percent of the United States workforce does not have paid family leave through their employer.

(10) The real value of the Federal minimum wage today is at historically low levels, and has not been increased since 2009.

(11) Increasing the minimum wage would give a raise to millions of workers, lift many Americans out of poverty, and put more money in the pockets of individuals who are likely to spend additional income. This would help expand the economy and create jobs.

(12) A higher minimum wage will reduce Government spending on Medicaid, public housing, nutrition assistance and other income-support programs that provide assistance to minimum wage workers. A higher minimum wage will also benefit businesses by increasing productivity, reducing absenteeism, and reducing turnover.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution to accomplish the following:

(1) That the House should broaden access to college, including through new initiatives

to make college more affordable, increase college completion rates, and lower student debt. This includes, but is not limited to, helping millions of families afford the cost of college by: permanently extending and improving the American Opportunity Tax Credit; maintaining Pell grants as the primary source of Federal grant aid; and accommodating legislation to help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options.

(2) That the House should preserve key work and family supports by permanently extending enhanced refundability of the Child Tax Credit, permanently extending the increased Earned Income Tax Credit benefits for married couples and families with 3 or more children, and expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit for childless workers and non-custodial parents.

(3) That the House should make a positive difference in the lives of women, enacting measures to address economic equality and support work and family balance through earned paid sick leave, and earned paid and expanded family and medical leave. The resolution provides funding to help States establish paid leave programs.

(4) That women receive equal pay for equal work.

(5) That the House should pass an increase in the minimum wage. A higher minimum wage will benefit both workers and the economy as a whole.

SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT, AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT.

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

(1) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(2) Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years.

(3) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country—including more than 13 million working women—are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(4) Nearly one-quarter of adults in the U.S. report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child or relative.

(5) Only 87 percent of the U.S. workforce does not have paid family leave through their employers, and more than 60 percent of the workforce does not have paid personal medical leave through an employer-provided temporary disability program, which some new mothers use.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should make a positive difference in the lives of women, enacting measures to address economic equality and women's health and safety. Those measures include the following:

(1) To address economic fairness, Congress should enact the Paycheck Fairness Act, increase the minimum wage, support women entrepreneurs and small businesses, and support work and family balance through earned paid sick leave, and earned paid and expanded Family and Medical leave.

(2) To address health and safety concerns, Congress should increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, support access to family planning, and enact measures to prevent and protect women from domestic violence.

SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

(1) Over the years, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has faced funding shortfalls and was unprepared to meet the demands of a new generation of returning veterans.

(2) Access to quality health care and veterans' benefits has been an ongoing challenge for the VA, highlighted most recently in the ongoing claims backlog and veterans waiting months for health care appointments.

(3) Providing health care where veterans live and ensuring a sufficient number of health care professionals, especially in the area of mental health treatment, have also been challenges.

(4) The Government shutdown in the fall of 2013 led to furloughs at the VA that slowed the processing of benefit claims.

(5) The President's budget includes an 8 percent increase over current year funding, which provides the resources to improve the timely delivery and the quality of health care services, and to address other urgent issues, such as ending veterans' homelessness.

(6) The VA currently has advance appropriations for 85 percent of its discretionary budget. The residual 15 percent, which includes funding for the day-to-day operations at the Veterans Benefits Administration, remains vulnerable to a Government shutdown.

(7) Congress provided the authority to expand advance appropriations for VA's three largest mandatory programs in the FY 2015 Omnibus; Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (Public Law 113-235).

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the President's requested level for veterans' discretionary programs be fully supported so that the VA has the resources it needs to ensure veterans get the benefits they earned in a timely fashion;

(2) advance appropriations be expanded to cover all of VA's discretionary budget to prevent delays in veterans' benefits and services during a Government shutdown;

(3) the VA submit along with its annual budget a "Future-Years Veterans Program" that projects its needs over five years to help facilitate the appropriations and oversight processes; and

(4) sufficient resources are provided for the VA's Office of the Inspector General to guarantee veterans are properly served and that resources are spent efficiently.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

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

(1) The Federal workforce provides vital services to our nation on a daily basis. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cyber-attacks, find cures to deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe.

(2) Last year alone, Federal employees addressed a wide range of national priorities, from responding to the Ebola outbreak to helping reduce veterans' homelessness to helping millions obtain affordable health care.

(3) Veterans make up 30 percent of the Federal workforce.

(4) Many Federal workers are paid at a rate that is far below their private sector counterparts.

(5) The Federal workforce is older than in past decades and older than the private sector workforce. It is estimated that twenty-

five percent of the Federal workforce intends to retire over the next five years.

(6) Over the last five years, the Federal workforce has contributed more than \$150 billion toward reducing the country's deficits in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, and increased retirement contributions.

(7) The Federal workforce endured furloughs from sequestration and the 16-day Government shutdown.

(8) Since 1975, the security and non-security parts of the Federal workforce have declined 33 and 38 percent, respectively, relative to the population.

(9) Nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 and 2014 is due to increases at security-related agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Justice.

(10) Proposals to reduce the size of the workforce at non-security agencies by 10 percent have excluded an assessment of their impact on Government services.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Federal employees should not be targeted to achieve further reductions in the deficit as they have already contributed more than their fair share, that Federal workers should be compensated with pay and benefits at a level that enables the Government to attract high quality people—which is especially important during this period when more workers will be retiring—and that no proposal to reduce the size of the workforce should be considered without an assessment of its impact on Government services.

SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

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

(1) Access to opportunity should be the right of every American.

(2) Poverty has declined by more than one-third since 1967. Federal programs and tax policies that strengthen economic security and increase opportunity have played an important role in this decline. Continued Federal support is essential to build on these gains.

(3) Social Security has played a major role in reducing poverty. Without it, the poverty rate in 2013 would have been 8.6 percentage points higher. Its positive impact on older Americans is even starker, lowering the poverty rate among this group by nearly 40 percentage points.

(4) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts nearly 5 million people out of poverty, including over 2 million children. School breakfast and lunch programs help keep children ready to learn, allowing them to reach their full potential.

(5) Medicaid improves health, access to health care, and financial security. Medicaid coverage lowers infant, child, and adult mortality rates. Medicaid coverage virtually eliminates catastrophic out-of-pocket medical expenditures, providing much needed financial security and peace of mind.

(6) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit (CTC) together lift over 9 million people, including 5 million children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed the major EITC expansion in the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which he referred to as “the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress”. Studies indicate that children in families that receive the type of income supports EITC and CTC offer do better at school and have higher incomes as adults.

(7) Antipoverty programs have increasingly been focused on encouraging and rewarding work for those who are able. The programs can empower their beneficiaries to rise to the middle class through job training, educational assistance, adequate nutrition, housing and health care.

(8) Despite our progress, there is still work to be done. Nearly 50 million Americans still live below the poverty line. Parental income still has a major impact on children's income after they become adults.

(9) There remain significant disparities across racial and ethnic lines. At the end of 2013, the unemployment rate for whites was 6.0 percent but was 8.4 percent for Hispanics and 11.8 percent for African Americans. The poverty rate among African Americans and Hispanics is nearly double that for whites. Disparities in wealth are even starker, with white households having nearly 13 times the median wealth of African American households and 11 times the median wealth of Hispanic households.

(10) The minimum wage has not changed since 2007 and is worth less today than it was in real terms at the beginning of 1950. Raising the minimum could lift millions out of poverty.

(11) Some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Residents of these areas often lack access to quality schools, affordable health care, and adequate job opportunities.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the sense of the House to support a 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. The strategy must include a multi-pronged approach that would:

(1) Ensure a livable wage for workers, including raising the minimum wage so that a full time worker earns enough to be above the poverty line.

(2) Provide education and job training to make sure workers have the skills to succeed.

(3) Provide supports for struggling families in difficult economic times and while developing skills.

(4) Remove barriers and obstacles that prevent individuals from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities.

(5) Provide supports for the most vulnerable who are not able to work: seniors, the severely disabled, and children.

As the strategy is developed and implemented, Congress must work to protect low-income and middle-class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that help millions of struggling American families. The strategy should maximize the impact of antipoverty 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 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 historical poverty, unemployment, and general distress. For example, the idea of targeting ten percent of certain Federal funding to areas where twenty percent or more of the population has been living below the poverty line for at least thirty years should be explored.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON REJECTING THE SEQUESTER.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Reductions to discretionary programs necessitated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 caps will harm national security and important domestic investments.

(2) The caps took effect when Congress could not reach agreement on the deficit reduction goal established in that Act. They were never intended to be implemented. Rather they were designed to be a sword of Damocles, so austere and infeasible that they would motivate compromise on spending reductions and revenue increases.

(3) An important feature of the Act was its equal treatment for the defense and non-defense portions of the budget, which was to serve as an incentive to reach agreement for Members with varying priorities.

(4) The Act provided special procedures for certain program integrity efforts to encourage full funding. These efforts pay for themselves by making sure benefits go only to those who are eligible and taxes are paid as required by law. These procedures should be expanded where there is well documented evidence of effective efforts.

(4) Providing relief from unrealistically low spending caps by circumventing existing law is neither responsible nor transparent. Emergency and overseas contingency operations adjustments, which are not controlled by the caps, should not be used to fund base spending.

(5) The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 took an important first step in correcting the overly restrictive caps, providing relief in 2014 and 2015 in a fiscally responsible way. This budget continues that effort.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the Budget Control Act should be amended to increase its overly austere spending limits to the levels included in this resolution;

(2) increases in both defense and non-defense will make room for a range of domestic and security investments that will accelerate growth and expand opportunity; and

(3) additional special procedures should be established to improve tax code enforcement and to reduce improper payments in the unemployment insurance program as permitted in this resolution.

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

(1) More than 59 million Americans currently receive earned Social Security benefits and, for most, Social Security's modest benefits provide the majority of their income.

(2) Social Security benefits are becoming more critical to providing retirement income as fewer and fewer workers have access to traditional defined benefit retirement plans and many workers are unable to save adequate resources in retirement savings accounts.

(3) More than half of disabled workers receiving Social Security insurance payments would have fallen into poverty if they had not earned Social Security to protect them when they became severely disabled or terminally ill.

(4) The Social Security trust funds have a combined balance of \$2.8 trillion, built by contributions from American workers, enough to pay 100 percent of earned benefits until 2033.

(5) Social Security's Disability Insurance (DI) and Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) systems are intertwined both in their benefit structure and in their revenues—DI recipients who reach retirement age receive OASI benefits and beneficiaries in each category have helped finance the other category even if they will never receive those benefits.

(6) In the short-term, the projected shortfall in the DI trust fund should be addressed through changes that permit Social Security to use its existing overall resources to fund DI benefits.

(a) **POLICY.**—This resolution assumes action by the House of Representatives to enact legislation that uses Social Security's existing reserves to prevent cuts in Social Security's earned benefits, and makes no changes to Social Security that involve reductions in earned Social Security benefits.

SEC. 511. 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 2015, 55,300,000 people will rely 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 costs than private insurance, and Medicare program costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) people with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet more than 70 percent of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2014;

(5) rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system;

(6) converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage;

(7) a voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(8) 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

(9) versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickest beneficiaries in a program that will withdraw 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, financially penalize people for choosing traditional Medicare, or shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of health insurance, should be rejected.

SEC. 512. 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) 16,400,000 uninsured individuals have gained health coverage so far as a result of the Affordable Care Act, and the uninsured rate for working-age adults has dropped from 20.3 percent to 13.2 percent since October 2013, when the ACA marketplaces opened for business;

(3) the Affordable Care Act will expand affordable coverage for up to 25,000,000 people by the end of the decade who would otherwise be uninsured;

(4) the Affordable Care Act ensures the right to equal treatment for people who have preexisting health conditions and for women;

(5) the Affordable Care Act ensures that health insurance coverage will always include basic necessary services such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and maternity care and that insurance companies cannot impose lifetime or annual limits on these benefits;

(6) the Affordable Care Act increases transparency in health care, helping to reduce health care cost growth by requiring transparency around hospital charges, insurer cost-sharing, and kick-back payments from pharmaceutical companies to physicians;

(7) 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 since 2011, national health expenditures have grown at the slowest rate on record;

(8) health care spending per capita in the United States grew in 2011, 2012, and 2013 at the lowest rates on record, and the Congressional Budget Office now projects that the Affordable Care Act's coverage provisions will cost a full 33 percent less in 2019 than the agency originally estimated when the Act became law in 2010; and

(9) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than \$1,000,000,000 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. 513. 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, and will provide health coverage to 69,000,000 Americans in 2015, including 1 in 3 children;

(2) Medicaid improves health outcomes, access to health services, and financial security;

(3) seniors, people with disabilities, and children account for about three-fourths of Medicaid program spending and would be at risk of losing access to health care under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(4) Medicaid is the primary payer for long-term care in the United States, providing financial assistance to seniors and people with disabilities facing significant out-of-pocket costs for in-home and nursing home services; and

(5) an estimated 7 in 10 Americans aged 65 or older will need long-term services and supports 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 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 demographics or health care costs or from economic conditions.

SEC. 514. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INVESTMENTS THAT HELP CHILDREN SUCCEED.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Investments in early childhood benefit the economy as a whole, generating at least \$7 in return for every \$1 invested by lowering the need for spending on other services—such as remedial education, grade repetition, and special education—and increasing productivity and earnings for those children as adults.

(2) High-quality, affordable child care helps two generations to succeed, increasing employment and earnings for parents while promoting a healthy growing and learning environment for children.

(3) Unfortunately, only one out of every six eligible children is able to access care through the child care and development block grant, and only three out of every ten 4-year-olds are enrolled in high-quality early childhood education programs in the United States.

(4) In particular, children from low-income families are less likely to have access to high-quality, affordable preschool programs that will prepare them for kindergarten. By third grade, children from low-income families who are not reading at grade level are six times less likely to graduate from high school than students who are proficient.

(5) Voluntary home visits to families with young children in at-risk communities have been shown to improve maternal and child health, promote child development and school readiness, and help prevent child abuse and neglect. Home visiting programs have created savings, reducing Medicaid costs by lowering the number of preterm births and use of hospital emergency rooms, reducing the need for public benefits and child protective services, and increasing tax revenues through higher parental earnings.

(6) The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is an important source of health care coverage for more than 8 million children in families who earn too much to qualify for Medicaid but who struggle to meet everyday expenses. Due in large part to CHIP, the rate of uninsured children in the U.S. fell from 13.9 percent to 7.1 percent between 1997 and 2012.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that this resolution supports funding for, and assumes enactment of, the following:

(1) A 10-year child care initiative that would ensure that all low- and moderate-income working families with children aged three and below would have access to affordable, quality child care.

(2) A 10-year investment to provide access to high-quality early education for all 4-year-olds. Early education programs must meet quality benchmarks that are linked to better outcomes for children, including a rigorous curriculum tied to State-level standards, qualified teachers, small class sizes, and effective evaluation and review of programs.

(3) Extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and extension and expansion of the existing highly effective voluntary home-visiting program for at-risk children.

SEC. 515. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

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

(1) Fixing the country's broken immigration system will mean a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that enacting the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress, will reduce

the deficit by \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and increase productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimates that immigration reform will reduce the Social Security shortfall by 8 percent and will extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by two years.

(4) The passage of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act recognizes that the primary tenets of its success depend on securing the sovereignty of the United States of America and establishing a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(5) We have a right, and duty, to maintain and secure our borders, and to keep our country safe and prosperous. As a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants we also have a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition in a balanced way that secures a more prosperous future for America.

(6) We have always welcomed newcomers to the United States and will continue to do so. But in order to qualify for the honor and privilege of eventual citizenship, our laws must be followed. The world depends on America to be strong—economically, militarily and ethically. The establishment of a stable, just, and efficient immigration system only supports those goals. As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for seeking citizenship, to control the flow of legal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.

(7) All parts of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act are premised on the right and need of the United States to achieve these goals, and to protect its borders and maintain its sovereignty.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the full House vote on comprehensive immigration reform—such as the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act—to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and secure our borders.

SEC. 516. 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) in testimony before the House Armed Service Committee on March 18, 2015, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated that the Defense Department needs funding it requests for regular, “base budget” activities appropriated in the base budget because it provides stability in planning for the future;

(4) in testimony before the House Armed Service Committee on March 18, 2015, Under Secretary of Defense Michael McCord said the Pentagon does not need \$36 billion or \$38 billion extra in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget;

(5) OCO designation has been used as a backdoor loophole to fund regular base budget activities. This gimmick avoids confronting the problem of sequestration and does not address the country’s priorities in a comprehensive and transparent manner. In addition to undermining the integrity of the budget process, it perpetuates funding uncertainty for all Government agencies, including the Department of Defense;

(6) 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;

(7) the Nation’s projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem;

(8) reining 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 needs to continue as a priority;

(9) according to GAO, 42 percent of the Department of Defense’s major weapons system acquisition programs had unit cost growth of 25 percent or more and 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;

(10) 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;

(11) weapons technologies should be proven to work through adequate testing before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(12) the Pentagon’s operation and maintenance budget 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;

(13) nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2014 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of Justice—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;

(14) 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

(15) 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 the House that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2016 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is bal-

anced, 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; and

(2) efficiencies can be achieved in 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 national security needs.

SEC. 517. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

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

(1) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, “a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government”.

(2) The Department of Defense’s Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap warns, “Climate change will affect the Department of Defense’s ability to defend the Nation and poses immediate risks to U.S. national security”.

(3) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Climatic Data Center reported 14 of the 15 warmest years on record occurred in the first 15 years of this century. Furthermore, 2014 was the warmest year on record across global land and ocean surfaces.

(4) The United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, “The impacts of climate change have already been felt in recent decades on all continents and across the oceans”.

(5) The United States National Research Council’s National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects, “human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, coastal areas, and many other sectors of society, with increasingly adverse impacts on the American economy and quality of life”.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government. Climate change science provides critical information for protecting human health, defending the United States, and preserving economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 518. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON FINANCIAL CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the Bureau) created by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is an important component of the country’s response to the financial crisis and recession;

(2) the Bureau is playing a critical role in protecting student loan borrowers, older Americans, service members, and other consumers, especially in minority and low-income communities. It has implemented new rules for mortgage markets and prepaid cards, and also successfully recovered \$5.3 billion on behalf of more than 15 million consumers and service members;

(3) the Bureau’s funding from the Federal Reserve’s operations help give it important independence from efforts to interfere with its vital mission and activities, independence on par with every other banking regulator; and

(4) the Bureau has already faced and overcome efforts to obstruct its operations.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House Congress will continue to support the vital work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and retain its current financing structure to fund its resource needs.

SEC. 519. 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, Barbershop, 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. 520. 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) The Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs “could lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings, with significant opportunities for improved efficiencies, cost savings, or revenue enhancements”.

(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 \$125 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2014.

(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 2016, 35 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.—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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I am putting forward the Democratic alternative budget on behalf of my colleagues. It is based on a very different view of how our economy in this country has grown historically and how it should grow in the future.

As we have heard from our Republican colleagues, their theory of the economy is top down, trickle down. They want to cut the top tax rates for folks at the very top, the millionaires, on the hope that the benefits will trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that under President Bush. It lifted up folks who were already at the top of the ladder. Everybody else was running in place or falling behind.

We believe that you accelerate economic growth through more opportunity and more shared prosperity, not from the top down, but by making sure that hard-working Americans can earn a little bit more and go out and spend it at the shopping center and in any way they want to support their families and have a good standard of living.

So while the Republican budget helps folks at the very top with additional tax rate cuts and squeezes working families, our budget provides more relief to those working families. How? We adopt, for example, the President’s proposed expanded child and dependent care tax credit. So if you are a working family and you want to make sure your child has a safe and secure environment with quality care, like every family would who is working, we provide a much bigger tax credit so that you can ensure that quality and safer environment for your child. Or if you have a loved one at home, an elderly loved one at home, but you are working, we want to make sure that you have a tax credit so that the costs you pay for that care don’t come out of your paycheck at the end.

The Democratic budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget, which actually increases the costs on working families. They get rid of the college tax deduction; they get rid of the step-up on the child tax credit; they get rid of the step-up on the Making Work Pay earned income tax credit; and of course they wipe out the Affordable Care tax credits that help millions of Americans have affordable health care. So their budget is squeezing folks in the middle and working toward the middle.

They raise the interest rates on college students. We provide additional resources to help make college more affordable, and we adopt the President’s plan for income-based student loan repayments.

They will immediately increase the cost for prescription drugs for seniors on Medicare and increase the copays for preventive care, for people who have worked hard for a secure environment. We don’t do that in our budget.

So this is a budget that supports working families in America and in-

vests in our future, not one that squeezes those families harder and disinvests in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I want to join with my colleague on the Committee on the Budget, the ranking member, in providing a letter for the RECORD commending Doug Elmendorf, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, whose time at the CBO is coming to a close. His final day is March 31. He has served this Nation for the last 6 years as the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and I will be inserting a letter into the RECORD to commend him for his service.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland to say a few words about Director Elmendorf.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and us working together to salute Dr. Elmendorf, who, by all accounts, has done a terrific job at the Congressional Budget Office. He has led that office with great professionalism, and I think he has continued to uphold the integrity of CBO. I think we have all benefited from his wisdom over the years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN TOM PRICE, M.D.
AND RANKING MEMBER CHRIS VAN HOLLEN
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

RECOGNIZING DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, DIRECTOR OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Douglas W. Elmendorf is the eighth Director of the Congressional Budget Office who was initially appointed on January 22, 2009, to complete the previous four-year term of office; he was later reappointed to serve through January 3, 2015. Dr. Elmendorf graciously agreed to remain at CBO beyond the end of his term to ensure CBO’s smooth and steady operations while the process of appointing his successor was completed. His tenure as CBO Director is the second longest of all CBO’s directors, behind only CBO’s first director, Alice Rivlin.

Before he came to CBO, Dr. Elmendorf was a senior fellow and the Edward M. Bernstein Scholar in the Economic Studies program at the Brookings Institution. He was previously an assistant professor at Harvard University, a principal analyst at CBO, a senior economist at the White House’s Council of Economic Advisers, a deputy assistant secretary for economic policy at the Treasury Department, and an assistant director of the Division of Research and Statistics at the Federal Reserve Board. In those positions, he worked on budget policy, Social Security, Medicare, health care issues, financial markets, macroeconomic analysis and forecasting, and other topics. He earned his Ph.D. and A.M. in economics from Harvard University, where he was a National Science Foundation graduate fellow, and his A.B. *summa cum laude* from Princeton University.

While Dr. Elmendorf’s credentials clearly qualified him to be the CBO Director, he

would probably be the first to say that nothing can really prepare you for the job. We in Congress place heavy and sometimes unreasonable demands on CBO to produce non-partisan, high-quality analyses in a timely fashion. Under his leadership, CBO has consistently responded to these demands and helped us to understand the budgetary and economic implications of our actions. The legislative issues have been contentious and complex. But throughout his tenure, CBO has remained true to its nonpartisan tradition and has provided the high-quality, cutting-edge analysis that we need under extremely challenging circumstances.

Under his leadership, CBO has been a consistent and dependable source of objective information and analysis on a range of critically important issues. For example, as Congress grappled with the aftermath of the fiscal crisis and recession, he enhanced CBO's capacity to perform cutting-edge analysis of the economic effects of various policy responses, and he has continued to strengthen CBO's capabilities in that area and in many others. Along with high-quality analysis, he was worked hard to be sure that CBO provided clear explanations of both the basis and results of those analyses—through the clarity of its reports and, on many occasions, through his clear and cogent testimony before Congressional committees. And he has made himself personally available—at all times of day and night—to Members on both sides of the aisle to receive our urgent requests for estimates, to answer our questions, or to hear our complaints.

Dr. Elmendorf has never shied away from delivering tough and sometimes blunt messages to lawmakers about the fiscal challenges that the nation is facing. He has never stepped over the line to tell us what we should do, but he has made very clear that the status quo is not an option over the long term. In the end, his professionalism and conviction are the hallmarks of a strong CBO director.

As CBO transitions to new leadership, we thank Doug for his time as director and for the dedication, energy, and commitment he has brought to the position. CBO, the Congress, and the people of this nation have been served well by the outstanding leadership of Douglas W. Elmendorf.

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
*Chairman, House
Budget Committee.*
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,
*Ranking Democrat,
House Budget Committee.*

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do want to commend my Democratic colleagues for coming forward with a budget. It is important to have contrasting visions that are able to be debated here on the floor of the House.

I am not surprised, but I am oftentimes amused by the misinformation and the distortion that comes from our colleagues on the other side. Mr. Chairman, we have had now three separate budgets that have been offered by our friends on the other side: first, the Progressive Caucus budget, then the CBC budget, now the Democratic Caucus budget.

I want to have our colleagues focus on the comparison, side by side, of this budget that is being offered to that of the Republican budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. These numbers on the far column there of the Democratic budget identify specific

areas in their budget and how they compare to the Republican budget.

In taxes, how do they compare in taxes? You hear our friends talking about taxes all the time. \$1.9 trillion in new taxes—\$1.9 trillion. Spending, what do they do on spending? \$6.3 trillion in spending over the Republican budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. What about deficits? \$4.6 trillion in increased deficits. Debt? \$4.7 trillion in increased debt over a 10-year period of time. What do they do to defense in these perilous times in our Nation and in our world? Decrease spending on defense compared to the Republican budget by \$314 billion.

You would think with all of those taxes and all of that spending that you would get to balance, you would get to a point where the revenue that is coming into the Federal Government would equal the spending that is going out, but their budget never, ever, ever, ever balances. I guess they take their lead from the President.

So let's take a little closer look at a couple of these issues.

Tax increases. Taxes, taxes, taxes, taxes; that is what we hear from the folks on the other side. After raising over a trillion dollars in taxes for ObamaCare and forcing through over \$600 billion in new taxes during the fiscal cliff discussion and debate, now they are calling for another massive tax increase of \$1.9 trillion. Even with these huge tax increases already enacted into law, the Democrat budget never balances—ever, ever, ever—because it refuses to reduce spending, and it refuses to address the biggest drivers of our debt.

Their substitute calls for more taxes on families, more taxes on small businesses. Even though, Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the Federal revenue collection will exceed, will be greater than the 40-year average level—about 17.4 percent of gross domestic product, every year greater than that number, every year for the next decade—that is not enough for our friends on the other side. In other words, Washington is on track to collect more taxes from the American people than it ever has in the past, but Democrats want Washington to take even more.

□ 1530

As has been said so many times, Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; we have got a spending problem—and there is no doubt about it that the American people understand that.

The Democratic budget rhetoric claims to raise an additional \$1.9 trillion by "rejecting tax breaks for the wealthy and closing special interest loopholes."

Look out, ladies and gentlemen. What that clever rhetoric really means is that they are going to hit small businesses with even more taxes. Why? Why is that? Because the majority of

small businesses, non-C corp businesses, the majority of those businesses that create jobs around this country pay taxes under the individual income system. That is how they do it. That is who those folks want to punish—the job creators.

These tax hike ideas end up impacting successful small businesses all across this country. As I mentioned, they represent the job creation engine of our economy, over 60 percent of the jobs being created—two-thirds of the jobs being created—for all private sector jobs generated by small businesses.

So, despite the facts that we present, the Democrat budget would continue the failed policy of Washington picking winners and losers, rewarding their friends, punishing their political enemies, distorting the free market, further distorting an already overly complex Tax Code, all of which would have disastrous results of subsidizing private investors' profits and socializing what should be private investors' losses. So, more taxes.

What about spending cuts? Any spending cuts?

Despite their call for a balanced approach, the Democrat budget never, ever balances. In fact, it doesn't even come close to passing the Democrats' prior test of balance, which they defined as having equal parts tax increases and spending reductions.

Interestingly, the Democrats continue to be moving away from their previously described balanced approach. Under this approach, their latest budget, a balanced approach appears to be requiring both tax increases and spending increases. In fact, the Democratic substitute would increase spending by \$855 billion more than just staying on our current path.

In other words, their substitute contains zero spending reductions and contains \$1.9 trillion in tax increases and \$855 billion in spending increases.

It is not the direction the American people desire, clearly; not the direction that gets on a path to balance; not the direction that get us on a positive solution to addressing the challenges that we face.

A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the direction in which we need to go, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let's just dispel with a myth from the start, which is that the Republican budget balances.

As we have heard, only if you believe in budget quackery does it do this. Even a newspaper like USA Today, which has no partisan bent to it, blew the whistle on all the accounting gimmicks in the Republican budget.

Now, let me just say a word about revenues and taxes. The Democratic budget doesn't call for any increase in any tax rate on anybody, unlike the Republican budget that refuses to close one special interest tax break to reduce

the deficit, which they say is the primary objective. Rather than close one special interest tax break to reduce the deficit, they don't touch a single one—not for corporate jets, not for hedge fund managers.

I want everybody to look at this chart. This is from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. What they say is that each year there are outlays. We spend \$1.4 trillion on tax breaks in the United States—more than on Social Security in any year, more than on Medicaid and Medicare combined.

Well, if I give you, Mr. Speaker, a thousand dollars from the government, I can also deliver that same benefit by telling you that of the taxes you owe me, pay me a thousand dollars less. Maybe you have got a great powerful lobbyist who is getting you a special break, so that when the normal person has to pay regular tax rates, you get a special deduction.

Now, some of the deductions are for good causes, but many are not. And where do most of those tax breaks go—or should I say a disproportionate amount of those tax benefits, often put there by powerful lobbyists? Again, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that 17 percent of the benefits of those tax breaks, special deductions, 17 percent go to the top 1 percent of income earners.

So it is true. The Democratic budget does want to close some of those special interest tax breaks that go to folks at the very top rather than cut our kids' education, rather than slash our investment innovation.

And lo and behold, we saw the most recent example of the Republican plan to provide more tax breaks to the folks at the very top end of the income scale just today in the Ways and Means Committee.

Right now you don't have any estate tax obligation as a couple if your estate is lower than \$10 million. If your estate is lower than \$10 million per couple, your estate is exempt. But we do have a tax rate on the amount over \$10 million because I thought in this country we do not believe that people should get ahead just by the wealth they inherited from others, but through their hard work and labor.

So we proposed to change the Tax Code in a way that rewards work rather than in a way that just rewards inherited wealth of \$10 million, an estate that is going to help just 5,000 families.

That is why the Democratic budget rewards hard-working families rather than other tax rates for folks at the top.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from Maryland will be pleased to know that our vision for tax reform is positive, robust, and makes certain that all Americans benefit. That is what our budget does. It lifts up all Americans. We don't pick win-

ners and losers. We are not interested in dividing the country.

What our friends on the other side seem to have as their stock in trade is dividing, pitting one American against another. That is not America. Good gracious almighty.

Let's talk about taxes. They want to increase taxes as far as the eye can see. They don't want to bring about any spending reductions, understanding that what is happening right now in terms of the debt in this country, what we have got is a level of debt that was only surpassed during World War II.

This is a chart that demonstrates the debt of this country from 1940 through 2040, projections from 2015 on. Our debt right now is at a level that was only surpassed at the end of World War II.

And where does current law take it? Where does the budget that our friends on the other side of the aisle propose take the debt? Higher than ever before—ever in the history of the country.

What does that red line mean? It means fewer jobs, fewer opportunity choices for individuals, fewer dreams realized, Mr. Chairman. This red line is the destruction of the American Dream. That is what it is.

That is why our Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the way to go. It gets our economy under control, gets the economy rolling again, gets the debt under control, gets us to balance, and puts us on a path to paying off the debt.

What do they want to do with spending? It follows the same tried and failed plan of more spending, with the promise of deficit reduction and economic growth later, which never occurs. We have tried it before. We know the results.

What did we achieve for all the spending that our friends on the other side of the aisle have brought about? The lowest labor force participation rates in decades. What does that mean? Fewer people working, Mr. Chairman. Poverty rates stuck at high levels. Twenty percent of the kids in this country are living in poverty right now. That is under the policies that these folks want to double down on.

We have seen the Washington metropolitan area is the home of 6 of the 10 richest counties in all of America. That is a Federal Government that has grown beyond all proportion. And we have seen, as I mentioned, levels of debt that haven't been seen since the end of World War II.

So, if more government spending led to higher growth in job creation, we would be experiencing an economic boom the likes of which we have never seen. But the economic track record of recent years clearly has been abysmal.

Real GDP growth over the past 4 years averaged just over 2 percent, where the average of the last 40 years is over 30 percent. Those are real jobs, Mr. Chairman, that have been lost by this administration and by our friends who want to double down. It is the

slowest recovery that we have ever had coming out of an economic downturn.

The labor force participation rate is at 62.8 percent, the lowest level in over 35 years. Roughly 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed, and those who are working have seen meager, meager real wage growth.

So more taxes, no spending reductions, more spending, more debt, more destruction of jobs, more destruction of dreams. Sadly, that is what our friends on the other side of the aisle are proposing.

A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the way to go, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting listening to the chairman, since the nonpartisan CBO says the Republican budget will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democratic alternative budget we are discussing today, which addresses the many issues working families are dealing with, but there is one provision in particular that I want to highlight on long-term care.

As the ranking member and too many Americans know, long-term care is a concern that nearly every American family is confronting or will confront in the coming years. We have made great strides to improve our health care system in the last few years, but what we have a strong need for is a comprehensive, long-term plan for how seniors can get the day-to-day help they need for the basic tasks of living, like meal preparation, eating, bathing, and getting dressed in the morning.

Too many seniors today are relying on a complex, disconnected system full of barriers that doesn't work. It is a system designed for the 20th century, while we are living in the 21st century. Addressing it will save money and can improve the quality of life for many.

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

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

Mrs. DINGELL. So, to address this problem, the Democratic budget contains revenue-neutral language that would allow the House to consider legislation today to begin to resolve the long-term care crisis in our country. It is an important priority, and it is important that it has been included in our alternative budget.

My hope is that we can all work together on this soon in a bipartisan way. Not dealing with it is not going to make it go away, I thank the ranking member for working with us.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), another of our great new members of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NORCROSS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a Democratic statehouse where we had to find common ground with a Republican Governor in order to make a budget pass that made sense. Now I sit on the Budget Committee as a freshman here in Washington where we are asked to vote on a budget that makes no sense at all.

We all agree that students are now saddled with too much debt, and certainly my colleagues across the aisle want to cut \$220 billion from education funding, freeze Pell grants, and limit students' access to loan programs. That doesn't make sense.

We all agree that we need to create jobs and get businesses to reinvest here in America, and the best way to do that is to invest here, in ourselves, in America. Yet their budget provides no new resources to upgrade our transportation and water systems, expand access to high speed Internet, or harden our electric grid, which is at risk. That doesn't make sense.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative that will provide the tools students and families will need to survive and succeed in our economy, create jobs by investing in research and infrastructure, properly fund a strong national defense, and make good on our promise to our seniors by strengthening Medicaid and Social Security.

That makes sense. This is why I am asking for my colleagues to join with me and vote for the Democratic alternative.

□ 1545

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman for this process.

All day today, we have been considering substitute budgets, laid bare, in the people's House, in this Chamber, for everyone to view and critique; and I think that is a good thing.

Considering the Democrat substitute amendment, their budget, it adds an additional \$4.7 trillion to the debt versus our budget. As we stand here today, we already have \$18 trillion worth of debt and another at least \$100 trillion on the way over the next several decades, completely unsustainable.

This comes despite, under their plan, a \$1.9 trillion tax hike that we have al-

ready talked about. This shows, once again, that you can't solve our debt problems by chasing ever higher spending with ever higher taxes.

The fact of the matter is, right now, we take in, as a Federal Government, over \$2.5 trillion of the people's property. It is the people's property that we confiscate, some of it rightly so, to run the things that we need—but \$2.5 trillion, Mr. Chairman, we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem when you consider that we—excuse me. It is probably nearly \$3 trillion now when we kick in nearly \$3.5 trillion of spending also.

When you analyze this, if you look at it, the CBO said—and this was in a letter to former Chairman RYAN—that tax rates would have to nearly double by 2030 if we are to stabilize our debt by using tax increases alone, as this Democratic substitute would do.

Now, here is what CBO says about rates. By 2023, everyone's income tax would have to increase by 33 percent; by 2030, rates would have to increase by 48 percent, and by 2050, rates would have to increase by 86 percent in order to account for the debt load that the Democratic budget wants to put not only on us, but our children and grandchildren.

We stand here today as the first generation in American history that, by any objective measure, is going to leave the next one worse off.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an extra 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. We cannot let that happen. This is what we came to Congress to solve, at least for many of us, hopefully, Republicans and Democrats, so that we are not the first generation in American history to leave the next one worse off.

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

As we have heard throughout the debate, there is a fundamental difference in how the United States grows our economy. I think if you look, historically, the reason we have grown the economy over time is because, for a long period, especially in the postwar period, as Americans worked harder, they were able to translate that harder work into higher incomes.

We are supporting a tax system that rewards hard work. Our colleagues continue to stand by a tax system that actually gives better treatment to what is called unearned income, compared to earned income. In other words, if you earn income simply through making money off of money, you actually get a lower rate than money earned from hard work, like most Americans do every day.

When you look at the fact that 17 percent of the tax breaks in the country go to people in the top 1 percent, it is the Tax Code itself that is currently rigged in favor of powerful special interests.

Why should it be rigged against working people and in favor of people who can afford to hire powerful lobbyists to get tax breaks for themselves that benefit nobody else? That doesn't make any sense.

Today, just today, in the Ways and Means Committee, as I said, the committee that deals with taxes, our Republican colleagues are saying that they want to get rid entirely of the estate tax. Right now, if you are a couple, \$10 million of your estate is exempt. You don't pay a penny; but, yes, we do ask people who have accumulated lots of wealth to contribute a little bit to the country that helped them develop such a great lifestyle.

I thought we were a country where we wanted to reward people who pulled themselves up by their bootstraps through hard work; yet we have a Republican budget that says we are going to provide 5,500 families with this huge tax break today.

At the same time, we are cutting our investment in education, an investment that we know helps millions and millions of American families earn a better living over time; but, no, let's cut that. Let's increase the cost of student loans. Let's give 5,500 families a huge tax break.

Teddy Roosevelt would be turning in his grave at this Republican budget. He would support the Democratic budget that lifts up everybody, makes sure everybody gets a fair shake.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Let me just, again, underscore a couple of key points here. We saw, during the early years of the 2000s, what an economy based on the trickle-down theory looks like, right?

Under President Bush, the theory was, okay, we are just going to cut tax rates for millionaires, thinking that the benefits were going to lift up everybody in the economy. What happened in the real world to that economic theory? It crashed and burned.

The reality was that people at the top did very well. God bless them; they did great, but everybody else, they were running in place. Paychecks flatlined, wages stagnant, and this has been a chronic problem for some period of time; then we went off the cliff.

When President Obama was sworn in, we were losing 800,000 jobs every month. Now, we are coming out of that. Millions of people have gone back to work. We have got a long way to go, but we are coming out.

The Republican budget, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget

Office, will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. Why would we want to do that?

Again, their theory is let's accelerate economic growth by trying, again, what failed before. Look, the definition of insanity is trying the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result.

They want to cut top tax rates for folks at the top again. They want to eliminate the estate tax that will benefit 5,500 households, run up \$269 billion on the deficit. That is what they want to do.

The Democratic budget does something very different. We want to empower hard-working American families. We want to change the incentives in the Tax Code to incentivize higher pay.

For example, we say that corporations should not be able to deduct CEO and executive bonuses over \$1 million unless they are giving their workers a pay increase, right? Pay your CEOs whatever you want, but you don't get a taxpayer subsidy for those deductions if you are laying off workers or you are cutting their wages.

Corporations deducted about \$70 billion in CEO bonuses over a 3-year period, from 2007 to 2010. We say: Why should the taxpayers be doing that for corporations that are cutting pay for their employees?

Our Republican colleagues continue to embrace a tax code that is rigged in favor of folks who have powerful lobbyists here to get special interest deductions. That is why the top 1 percent get 17 percent of the value of all those tax breaks.

Let's have a tax system that incentivizes higher pay. Let's invest in our kids' future, not slash our investment in education and innovation. Let's invest in the future of America. That is what the Democratic budget does.

I urge adoption of the Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think it is important to recognize that the Congressional Budget Office actually says that our budget grows GDP at the end of the 10-year window that we talk about. In order to turn this battleship in a direction, it takes a little while, but we are prepared to do that. We are offering positive solutions.

I want to revisit, though, the debt. Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked just a few years ago what the greatest security threat to the United States was. The highest ranking military officer in the land was asked what the greatest threat to the United States was, and he said the debt.

This red line right here, this is what he was talking about, increasing debt beyond as far as the eye can see, more than we have ever had; and that is what the Democrat budget does.

This is the current path that we are on right now, unless it has changed: fewer jobs, fewer dreams realized, fewer opportunities, fewer choices for the American people.

What does a debt crisis look like? We haven't seen one here. What does it look like? Higher interest rates on everything from mortgages to credit cards to car loans, lower business investments and opportunities, lower wages for people struggling just to hold on to their jobs, fewer resources for critical government services, a crowding out of all the things that folks on both sides of the aisle say they want to use—in short, less opportunity, less hope, fewer dreams realized, a very sad future for America.

That is not us. That is not America. That is not the people that we are. What we are is a balanced budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, positive solutions.

Our budget proposes that we balance in less than 10 years, reduce spending by \$5.5 trillion over that period of time, strong support for our national defense, higher spending for national defense than the President or the Democrats proposed in these very dangerous times, repealing all of ObamaCare in its entirety—not just because it is harmful to the economy, it is harmful to the health of this Nation.

As a formerly practicing physician, I can attest to that. All you have to do is listen to my former professional colleagues.

We secure economic opportunity, fair and simple tax reform, ending the too-big-to-fail bank bailouts. We cut corporate welfare. We embrace federalism, including increasing opportunity and choices for folks, whether it is in the healthcare arena, whether it is in nutritional assistance, whether it is in education, getting those decisions back in the States and local communities where they belong.

To hold Washington accountable, we cut waste and fraud and abuse, make certain that we support the rights of conscience for healthcare providers and physicians across this land. We push back on the incredible overreach of this administration.

We stop the President's war on coal. We prevent his carbon tax increase. We hold the IRS accountable and make certain that they stop targeting the American taxpayers.

There is a positive vision for our country, Mr. Chair, a positive vision. It will deliver real results for the American people, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I urge a "no" vote on the substitute and a "yes" on Price 2 and the final passage of the budget at the end of all this. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the House Democratic budget, which invests in hardworking American families. Our budget gives Americans the opportunities they need to get ahead.

I also rise in opposition to the House Republican budget, which asks the American people to work harder for less money. It offers the same job-killing, paycheck-shrinking policies that Americans have opposed time and time again.

When you compare these two budgets, the choice becomes clear. The Democratic budget will grow our economy and create jobs. The Republican budget will slash our economic growth by 2.5 percent and cost our nation nearly three million jobs in 2017 alone.

The Democratic budget will preserve the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million Americans to obtain quality, affordable health coverage. The Republican budget will repeal the Affordable Care Act and eliminate this health coverage.

The Democratic budget makes room for comprehensive immigration reform, which will bring clarity to our immigration system, secure our borders, and foster economic growth. The Republican budget continues to ignore the critical issue of comprehensive immigration reform.

The Democratic budget will provide tax relief to hardworking families, including extensions of the Child Tax Credit, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and tax credits for higher education. The Republican budget will raise taxes by \$2,000 for a typical working family, while millionaires will get an average tax cut of more than \$200,000.

The Democratic budget will protect Medicaid for working families and preserve nutrition assistance for families with low incomes. The Republican budget will make steep cuts to Medicaid and nutrition assistance, which will jeopardize the health of millions of Americans, including children, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

The Democratic budget will preserve the Medicare guarantee. The Republican budget will eliminate the Medicare guarantee and raise traditional Medicare premiums by an average of 50 percent.

The Democratic budget will ensure access to a high quality education for all, and give students the assistance they need to pay for college. The Republican budget will end tax cuts that help millions of working families afford college, slash more than \$220 billion in funding for student loans and college aid, and gut investments in K–12 education.

The Republican budget does not come close to addressing the needs of our nation; on the contrary, their budget contains devastating cuts that will make life harder for the American people.

America needs the Democratic budget, which champions the interests of all Americans, rather than a fortunate few. The Democratic budget makes it easier for hardworking Americans to send their children to college, own a home, and have a secure and enjoyable retirement. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his leadership as our Ranking Member on the Budget Committee and I thank him for his commitment to helping America's working families.

Mr. Chair, as I've said—our budget is a statement of our national priorities.

The Republican budget tells the American people that our priority lies with the wealthy, special interests, and the top one-percent.

The House Republican Budget is rigged against American families.

It continues the failed austerity cuts that drive families further into poverty.

It forces draconian cuts on the poor, while offering more handouts to the wealthiest Americans.

It keeps special interest tax breaks while claiming that there is not enough left to educate our young people.

It is really unconscionable.

By contrast, the Democratic Alternative Budget demonstrates a true commitment to our American ideal of opportunity for all.

Our budget invests in families—too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

Our budget invests in our future by providing much-needed investments in our roads and bridges.

It expands proven anti-poverty programs like the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit to create pathways out of poverty.

And it increases funding for early childhood education, including the President's Early Childhood Education Initiative, so every toddler is prepared to start and succeed in school.

Finally—it includes comprehensive Immigration reform, which House Republicans have allowed to languish for two years since the Senate passed bipartisan reforms—so families can come out of shadows and have a shot at the American Dream.

This budget says that every single American—not just the wealthy few—deserves a chance to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-49 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. STUTZMAN of Indiana.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

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. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 330, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—96

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Baretta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock

Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore

Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer

Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert

NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa
O'Rourke
Payne
Ruiz
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)

□ 1624

Messrs. DOGGETT, PITTINGER, LARSON of Connecticut, STIVERS, GENE GREEN of Texas, FINCHER, FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 136 on H. Con. Res. 27 Ellison Amendment 1, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 120, noes 306, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—120

Adams	Fattah	Neal
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Nolan
Beatty	Fudge	Norcross
Becerra	Gallego	Pallone
Beyer	Grayson	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Pocan
F.	Gutiérrez	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Richmond
Butterfield	Higgins	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Honda	Rush
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Israel	T.
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Ciçilline	Johnson, E. B.	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Serrano
Clay	Kennedy	Sires
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Clyburn	Lawrence	Takai
Cohen	Lee	Takano
Conyers	Lewis	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	Lofgren	Tonko
Cummings	Lowenthal	Tsongas
Davis, Danny	Luján, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
DeFazio	(NM)	Vargas
DeLauro	Lynch	Veasey
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Vela
Deutch	McCollum	Velázquez
Dingell	McDermott	Wasserman
Doggett	McGovern	Schultz
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
F.	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Edwards	Meng	Welch
Ellison	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Nadler	Yarmuth
Farr	Napolitano	

NOES—306

Abraham	Brat	Comstock
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Conaway
Aguilar	Brooks (AL)	Connolly
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Cooper
Amodei	Buchanan	Costa
Ashford	Buck	Costello (PA)
Babin	Bucshon	Courtney
Barletta	Burgess	Cramer
Barr	Bustos	Crawford
Barton	Byrne	Crenshaw
Benishek	Calvert	Cuellar
Bera	Capps	Culberson
Bilirakis	Carney	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	DeGette
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Delaney
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DelBene
Bonamici	Coffman	Denham
Bost	Cole	Den
Boustany	Collins (GA)	DeSantis
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rice (SC)
Dold	Kuster	Rigell
Duckworth	Labrador	Roby
Duffy	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Elmners (NC)	Langevin	Rohrabacher
Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)	Rokita
Eshoo	Latta	Rooney (FL)
Fleming	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Lieu, Ted	Roskam
Fincher	Lipinski	Ross
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Loeb sack	Rouzer
Fleming	Long	Royce
Flores	Loudermilk	Ruppersberger
Forbes	Love	Russell
Fortenberry	Lowey	Ryan (WI)
Foster	Lucas	Salmon
Foxx	Luetkemeyer	Sanchez, Loretta
Franks (AZ)	Lujan Grisham	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	(NM)	Scalise
Gabbard	Lummis	Schock
Garamendi	MacArthur	Schrader
Garrett	Maloney,	Schweikert
Gibbs	Carolyn	Scott, Austin
Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Marchant	Sessions
Goodlatte	Marino	Sherman
Gosar	Massie	Shimkus
Gowdy	McCarthy	Shuster
Graham	McCaul	Simpson
Granger	McClintock	Sinema
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Grothman	McSally	Speier
Guinta	Meadows	Stefanik
Guthrie	Meehan	Stewart
Hanna	Messer	Stivers
Hardy	Mica	Stutzman
Harper	Miller (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Harris	Miller (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Heck (WA)	Moulton	Tiberi
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Tipton
Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney	Titus
Hill	Murphy (FL)	Torres
Himes	Murphy (PA)	Trott
Holding	Neugebauer	Turner
Hudson	Newhouse	Upton
Huelskamp	Noem	Valadao
Hultgren	Nugent	Visclosky
Hunter	Nunes	Wagner
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Walberg
Hurt (VA)	Palazzo	Walden
Issa	Palmer	Walker
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Walorski
Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Walters, Mimi
Johnson (OH)	Perlmutter	Walz
Johnson, Sam	Perry	Weber (TX)
Jolly	Peters	Webster (FL)
Jones	Peterson	Wenstrup
Jordan	Pittenger	Westerman
Joyce	Pitts	Westmoreland
Katko	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Keating	Poliquin	Williams
Kelly (PA)	Polis	Wilson (SC)
Kildee	Pompeo	Wittman
Kilmer	Posey	Womack
Kind	Price, Tom	Woodall
King (IA)	Quigley	Yoder
King (NY)	Ratcliffe	Yoho
Kinzinger (IL)	Reed	Young (AK)
Kirkpatrick	Reichert	Young (IA)
Kline	Renacci	Young (IN)
	Ribble	Zeldin
	Rice (NY)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1634

Messrs. NEAL and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 137 on H. Con. Res. 27 Butterfield Amendment 2, I mistakenly re-

corded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 132, noes 294, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—132

Aderholt	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amash	Harris	Pitts
Babin	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hensarling	Pompeo
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rice (SC)
Black	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rokita
Brat	Hunter	Rooney (FL)
Bridenstine	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Buck	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	King (IA)	Salmon
Byrne	Kline	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Labrador	Scalise
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Chabot	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Clawson (FL)	Latta	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Long	Shimkus
Conaway	Loudermilk	Love
DeSantis	Love	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Stewart
Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Stutzman
Farenthold	McCaul	Thornberry
Fincher	McClintock	Tipton
Fleischmann	McHenry	Trott
Fleming	McMorris	Walberg
Flores	Rodgers	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Walorski
Garrett	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Westerman
Gosar	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Williams
Granger	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Olson	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Yoho
Grothman	Perry	

NOES—294

Abraham	Boustany	Castor (FL)
Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Aguilar	F.	Chu, Judy
Allen	Brady (PA)	Ciçilline
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Clark (MA)
Ashford	Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)
Barletta	Brownley (CA)	Clay
Bass	Buchanan	Cleaver
Beatty	Bucshon	Clyburn
Becerra	Bustos	Coffman
Benishek	Butterfield	Cohen
Bera	Calvert	Cole
Beyer	Capps	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Capuano	Comstock
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carney	Conyers
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cook
Bost	Cartwright	Cooper

Costa	Jolly	Price, Tom
Costello (PA)	Jones	Quigley
Courtney	Joyce	Rangel
Cramer	Kaptur	Reed
Crawford	Katko	Reichert
Crenshaw	Keating	Renacci
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Richmond
Culberson	Kennedy	Rigell
Cummings	Kildee	Roby
Curbelo (FL)	Kilmer	Rogers (KY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Danny	King (NY)	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Knight	Royce
Delaney	Kuster	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Langevin	Rush
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Russell
Denham	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Dent	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lee	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff
Dold	LoBiondo	Schock
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrader
F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Duffy	Lowe y	Serrano
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Sherman
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Simpson
Engel	(NM)	Sinema
Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Esty	(NM)	Slaughter
Farr	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Fattah	MacArthur	Speier
Fitzpatrick	Maloney,	Stefanik
Forbes	Carolyn	Stivers
Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	Marino	Takai
Fox	Matsui	Takano
Fox	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Thompson (PA)
Fudge	McGovern	Tiberi
Gabbard	McKinley	Titus
Gallego	McNerney	Tonko
Garamendi	McSally	Torres
Gibbs	Meehan	Meng
Gibson	Meeks	Mica
Graham	Meng	Miller (MI)
Grayson	Mica	Mooney (WV)
Green, Al	Miller (MI)	Moore
Green, Gene	Mooney (WV)	Moulton
Griffith	Moore	Murphy (FL)
Grijalva	Moulton	Murphy (PA)
Guinta	Murphy (FL)	Nadler
Gutiérrez	Murphy (PA)	Napolitano
Hahn	Nadler	Neal
Hanna	Napolitano	Newhouse
Hardy	Neal	Noem
Harper	Newhouse	Nolan
Hastings	Noem	Norcross
Heck (NV)	Nolan	Nugent
Heck (WA)	Norcross	Nunes
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Pallone
Higgins	Nunes	Pascarell
Himes	Pallone	Paulsen
Honda	Pascarell	Pearce
Hoyer	Paulsen	Pelosi
Huffman	Pearce	Perlmutter
Hurd (TX)	Pelosi	Peters
Hurt (VA)	Perlmutter	Peterson
Israel	Peters	Pingree
Issa	Peterson	Pocan
Jackson Lee	Pingree	Poliquin
Jeffries	Pocan	Polis
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Posey
Johnson (GA)	Polis	Price (NC)
Johnson (OH)	Posey	
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1641

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. PITTINGER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, during the vote on the Butterfield/Scott (VA)/Lee/Moore Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27 and the Van Hollen Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27, I was inescapably detained in my congressional district attending vitally important district events commemorating the voting rights movement. If I had been present I would have voted "yes" on both of the aforementioned amendments in the nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27. Additionally, had I been present I would have voted "no" on the Stutzman/Flores Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute H. Con. Res. 27.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 264, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—160

Adams	Ellison	Lowe y
Aguliar	Engel	Lujan Grisham
Bass	Eshoo	(NM)
Beatty	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray
Becerra	Farr	(NM)
Beyer	Fattah	Lynch
Bishop (GA)	Poster	Maloney,
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bonamici	Fudge	Matsui
Boyle, Brendan	Gabbard	McCollum
F.	Gallego	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McNerney
Butterfield	Green, Al	Meeks
Capps	Green, Gene	Meng
Capuano	Grijalva	Moore
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Nadler
Cartwright	Hastings	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Neal
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Himes	Norcross
Ciilline	Honda	Pallone
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Pascarell
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Pelosi
Clay	Israel	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pocan
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kaptur	Quigley
Courtney	Keating	Rangel
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Kennedy	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Levin	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
F.	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lofgren	Scott, David
Edwards	Lowenthal	Serrano

Sherman	Titus	Walz
Sires	Tonko	Wasserman
Slaughter	Torres	Schultz
Speier	Tsongas	Waters, Maxine
Swalwell (CA)	Van Hollen	Watson Coleman
Takai	Vargas	Welch
Takano	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	

NOES—264

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Amash	Griffith	Paulsen
Amodei	Grothman	Pearce
Ashford	Guinta	Perry
Babin	Guthrie	Peters
Barletta	Hanna	Peterson
Barr	Hardy	Pittenger
Barton	Harper	Pitts
Benishek	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bera	Hartzler	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hill	Reed
Blum	Holding	Reichert
Bost	Hudson	Renacci
Boustany	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Brat	Hultgren	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hunter	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brownley (CA)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Bustos	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Byrne	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jones	Ross
Carney	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Katko	Royce
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Chaffetz	Kind	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (NY)	Sanford
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Comstock	Kline	Schrader
Conaway	Knight	Schweikert
Cook	Kuster	Scott, Austin
Cooper	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Costa	LaMalfa	Sessions
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cramer	Lance	Shuster
Crawford	Latta	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Sinema
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Long
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Love	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Delaney	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Denham	Lummis	Stewart
Dent	MacArthur	Stivers
DeSantis	Maloney, Sean	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Thornberry
Dold	Massie	Tiberi
Duffy	McCarthy	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Trott
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Turner
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Upton
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Valadao
Farenthold	McMorris	Visclosky
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walden
Fleming	Meehan	Walker
Flores	Messer	Walorski
Forbes	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Garrett	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gosar	Newhouse	Womack
Gowdy	Noem	Woodall
Graham	Nugent	Yoder
Granger	Nunes	

Yoho	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Young (AK)	Young (IN)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Burgess	O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)
Collins (NY)	Payne	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Ruiz	

□ 1652

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.
Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.
Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.
Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.
Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.
Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.
Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.
Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.
Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.

Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.

Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.

Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.

Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.

Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.

Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.

Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 601. Direct spending.

TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.

TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.

Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.

Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.

Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.

Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.

Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.

Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.

Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.

Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.

Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.

Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.

Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.

Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.

Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.

Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.

Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.

Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Sec. 819. Policy statement on “No Budget, No Pay”.

Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

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

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.
Fiscal year 2024: \$0.
Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,934,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,873,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,327,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,462,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,272,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,009,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,893,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,320,000,000.

(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 2016: -\$342,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -\$130,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -\$68,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$87,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$56,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$52,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$183,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$220,418,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,047,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$19,393,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$19,641,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$19,947,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$20,261,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$20,505,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$20,906,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$21,075,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$20,916,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,904,522,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,838,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: \$14,040,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: \$14,145,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$14,338,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,560,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,742,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$15,128,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$15,300,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$15,162,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$15,235,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (50):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$366,527,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$366,527,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$414,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$414,768,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$477,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,032,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$531,032,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$578,654,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$612,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$642,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$642,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$667,089,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$684,301,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$684,301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$695,929,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$695,929,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$33,462,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.
 (20) Government-wide savings (930):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$27,465,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,929,000,000.
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$73,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.
 (22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-
 al War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$94,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,758,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$21,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) 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 \$1,000,000,000

for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

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

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

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space,

and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in

the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(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 enforcing 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 discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

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. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), 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.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of

Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and 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.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN 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 budgetary effects 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 budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, 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 effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), 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. 407. 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 in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) 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 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, 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. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(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 budgetary 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 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) 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.

SEC. 411. 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 V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

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

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary 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 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure

reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 507. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 508. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure is related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism by the amounts provided in such legislation in excess of \$73.5 billion but not to exceed \$94 billion, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 601. 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 2016 is 6.8 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 2016 is 4.6 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 assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on 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.

(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 2016 is 5.4 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 2016 is 5.5 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. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with 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. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(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 VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) **REVENUES.**—The budgetary levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) **DEBT.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

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

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain

the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its “power of the purse”, and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way. Consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to “pay for”

merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and “reforms” enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress’s “power of the purse”, and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(9) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(10) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(11) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

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

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth

over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities.

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual's job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. 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. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(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 will 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 helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 804. 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 United States 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) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. 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 highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

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

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(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 can reach nearly 45 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 slightly more than 39 percent, the highest

rate in the industrialized world. 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 United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States 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 about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their retirement and their children's education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

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

(17) 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. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should

enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform 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 and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

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

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to “hollow out” United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biologic medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medicines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a “tax loophole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(11) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

SEC. 806. 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 nearly 23 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 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 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 CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 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 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission” which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) 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 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 should, 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 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President should 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 should 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 should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

- (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.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

- (1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;
- (2) prevent a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;
- (3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and
- (4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

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

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medi-

care by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSABILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insur-

ance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 808. 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 Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

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

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(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) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations 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;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

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

SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.

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

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outpace the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting

the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.

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

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the

manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

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

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

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

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: "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 now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, 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 2017 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 \$5,775 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.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the "high-risk" list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans' Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the

department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America's veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.

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

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The "accrual method" of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the "cash method" records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget

and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

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

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is ineffective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED 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 its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and

overlap in Federal programs could “lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.”

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

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

(C) twenty 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) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage “green building” in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. 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.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) 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.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should 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.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees’ judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House

rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(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 canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should 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 continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

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

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—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.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON “NO BUDGET, NO PAY”.

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.

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

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has “caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities”.

(4) The President’s fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the

caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated \$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151 billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Federal Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my col-

leagues for their participation yesterday. We had extensive debate on the committee mark yesterday; so I will review, very briefly, the committee mark and then touch on the differences between this and the next substitute amendment.

This amendment is the committee mark. It is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. As we have talked about, this balances the budget in less than 10 years. It does so without raising taxes, which is absolutely vital.

All of the other alternatives that were brought from our friends on the other side of the aisle to the floor today, every one of them, raised significant taxes on the American people. We set out a path to be able to provide for a fairer, simpler, a more appropriate tax code where Washington isn't picking winners and losers.

Our underlying resolution repeals all of ObamaCare. It eliminates the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It lays out a path for patient-centered health care, where patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C.

We ensure a strong national defense. Our numbers, when you combine the base budget with the global war on terror budget, are above the President's numbers required for making certain that our men and women who stand in harm's way have the resources available to make certain they can protect not just us, but protect themselves.

We secure our future by laying out a path to save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. It is so incredibly important. Medicare, itself, has been estimated by the trustees to go insolvent—to go broke—in 2033. It is absolutely vital that this Congress recognize the challenge before us and lay out a path for saving and strengthening and securing Medicare, and we do just that.

We restore federalism. We think it is important to increase choices and opportunities for the men and women back home. It is imperative that we have increased flexibility for States, not just in the area of health care and in the area of Medicaid, but also in the area of nutritional assistance and in the area of education. Folks in our States and in our local communities know better how to respond to the needs of their citizens; and we cut corporate waste, fraud, and abuse and corporate welfare.

Positive solutions, Mr. Chairman, in a bill that we label "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America," solutions that will get us on track to revive this economy, get folks back to work, and make certain that we put a cap on the debt and begin to put us on a path to paying off the debt, we can only do that if we get to balance.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage our colleagues to adopt and to support this substitute.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let me start with something, I think, Members who are listening to this debate should know already, which is that the Republican budget does not balance, not by a long shot.

It assumes the revenue from the Affordable Care Act even though they claim to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't account for the costs of additional tax cuts that are coming through this House as we speak, and, if the revenue from that were lost, their budget would be even further out of balance.

In fact, just today, in the Ways and Means Committee, they are increasing the deficit by over \$250 billion over 10 years by giving a huge tax cut to 5,500 families in getting rid of the estate tax.

Now, everyone should understand that the estate tax only applies to couples with estates worth over \$10 million. They are saying that people with estates worth \$10 million, who have done really well, shouldn't contribute anything toward investments in our country, even toward deficit reduction. That increases the deficit right away and puts their budget even more out of balance, so this doesn't come close to balancing.

While it is actually cutting special interest tax breaks for folks at the very high end of the income scale, it actually disinvests in the rest of the country. They dramatically cut the portion of our budget that we use to invest in our kids' futures, in early education, in kindergarten through grade 12.

They make it harder for students to afford college. They say they are going to start charging students interest while they are still in college, even though we have record student debt of over \$1 trillion in this country.

□ 1700

They make it harder on seniors right away. Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs, seniors on Medicare; seniors will pay more in copays for preventive care. If they really got rid of the Affordable Care Act entirely, seniors would also be paying higher part B premiums. That is what they say they want to do, get rid of it entirely.

The Democratic budget which we put forward presents an alternative. We were disappointed that this body voted against that and decided, instead, to support a budget that squeezes hard-working families and is hard on everyone in America except for those who are already at the very top.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I ask the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I am prepared to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just emphasize a couple of specifics in the Republican budget that is before us.

We haven't talked a lot about seniors in nursing homes. You know, two-thirds of Medicaid goes to help seniors and disabled individuals in nursing homes, and yet the Republican budget cuts \$900 billion from Medicaid. The Congressional Budget Office says one of two things will happen: either States will increase taxes back home or seniors will get less care.

The Republican budget provides less for our veterans this year than the President's budget, less by \$1.9 billion, \$19 billion less for the Veterans Administration over the next 10 years compared to the President's budget.

At the same time, their budget plays games with defense spending. That is why we have so-called Price 1 and Price 2. Neither Price is right here. They both play games with our defense spending by using our defense overseas contingency account as a slush fund, something the Republican-led Committee on the Budget said last year they would not do. In fact, they said it was a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process.

This is the committee report. This is the Republican-drafted committee report when Mr. RYAN was chairman of the committee 1 year ago. Tear it up. Just as they said what they are doing would violate the integrity of the budget process, it does. That is exactly what it does. It plays games with our defense spending.

The President's budget, the Democratic budget, did this in a straightforward way. We said, look, Joint Chiefs of Staff, our military leadership says that they need a certain amount for funding our defense needs in our base budget and a certain amount for overseas contingencies. The President's budget and Democratic budget funded that. Republican budgets, all of them, all of the ones here, play games with that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope as we consider this Republican budget that plays games with defense spending, which disinvests in America and in our future, and which squeezes hard-working Americans every day even harder, working families, seniors, students—the only people it says, “Don't worry. You don't have to do more to help this country move forward” are folks at the very top. They get a tax rate cut, and they don't cut a single special interest tax break. That is the wrong way for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, somewhere across this land somebody has turned to their wife at home and said: “Hide the kids and pets, dear. They are talking about the budget.”

I really am amazed. Well, I shouldn't be amazed, but I really am amazed at the level of misinformation and hyperbole that goes on. The gentleman on the other side knows that the way that we treat the defense spending, \$613 billion with base defense and global war on terror funding, is exactly the way it has to be treated until the law is changed. The gentleman on the other side didn't even recognize that, the Democrats don't recognize that, the President doesn't recognize that. He puts a phony number in his budget that will snap right back down to the sequester level of \$523 billion unless the law is changed—something that we actually support, something in our budget that we provide a path to be able to do. We provide the path to a solution. The other folks are just providing rhetoric.

What about balance? Here are the deficits over the next 10 years, Mr. Chairman. The red line is current policy. What the President and our friends on the other side do actually mirrors, basically, that line. You will notice that at the end of this, this gets near to a trillion dollars of deficit in 1 year. These folks think you can just spend and spend and spend.

This is our line. This gets us down to balance. This is how you begin to pay off the debt. This is how you begin to provide greater opportunities for the American people, a budget of real hope, real opportunity. Our friends on the other side say it is harder on seniors and students and workers and Medicaid—not true. What we actually do is propose solutions to the challenges that we face.

We can't stick our head in the sand and expect these problems are going to get solved. I just wish that our friends on the other side would join us together and help solve these challenges. The challenges are huge. The American people know it.

What our budget does, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America actually lays out a path to be able to solve these challenges, positive solutions for the American people. They recognize that. We are standing up on behalf of all Americans to solve the challenges that we have. I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.

Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.

Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.

Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.

Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.

Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.

Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.

Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.

Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.

Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.

Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.

Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

- Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.
- Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.
- Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

- Sec. 601. Direct spending.
- TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS**
- Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.
- TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS**
- Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.
- Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.

- Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.
- Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.
- Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.
- Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 819. Policy statement on "No Budget, No Pay".
- Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

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

- (A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
 - Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

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

- 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.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$0.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$2,936,989,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,874,003,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,067,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,104,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,181,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,328,045,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,463,044,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,161,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,560,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,369,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$3,010,185,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,894,439,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,276,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,270,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,614,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,984,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,546,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,999,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,491,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,327,000,000.

(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 2016: -\$343,430,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: -\$131,111,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: -\$69,145,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: -\$88,123,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,204,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: -\$57,021,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,858,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$52,389,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$183,653,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$220,321,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$19,048,915,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$19,395,251,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$19,643,341,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$19,949,858,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$20,263,382,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$20,507,829,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$20,908,840,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$21,078,135,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$20,918,559,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$20,907,169,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2016: \$13,839,152,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$14,041,709,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$14,146,945,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$14,340,084,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$14,562,210,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$14,744,287,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$15,130,369,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$15,302,457,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$15,164,550,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$15,237,647,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 - Fiscal year 2016:
 - (A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2017:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2018:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2019:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2020:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2021:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2022:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2023:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2024:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2025:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$366,542,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$366,542,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$414,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$414,802,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$477,785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,785,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,097,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$531,097,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$578,726,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$612,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,198,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$642,470,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$642,470,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,176,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$667,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$684,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$684,394,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$696,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$696,025,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority -\$33,462,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.
 (20) Government-wide savings (930):
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority \$27,465,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$93,929,000,000.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority -\$73,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.

(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$96,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,442,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,940,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.

(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority -\$21,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) 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 \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by

\$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

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

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

(3) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates

established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) **GUIDANCE.**—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) **PUBLICATION.**—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) **SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.**—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) **SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.**—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) **HOUSE COMMITTEES.**—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) **REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.**—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) **CBO ESTIMATES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) **JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section—

(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(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 enforcing 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 discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

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. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), 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.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) **VETERANS.**—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) **FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.**—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget

Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and 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.

(b) **FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN 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 budgetary effects 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 budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, 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 effect.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), 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. 407. 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 in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.**—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) 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 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, 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. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending

(budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.

(a) **CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.**—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(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 budgetary 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 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) 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.

SEC. 411. 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 V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

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

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary 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 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 507. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 508. 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 budgetary 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 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit re-

forms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 601. 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 2016 is 6.8 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 2016 is 4.6 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 assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on 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.

(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 2016 is 5.4 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 2016 is 5.5 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. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with 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 ad-

ditional 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. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(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 VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

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

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

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

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) DEBT.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

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

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those

for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its “power of the purse”, and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way. Consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to “pay for” merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and “reforms” enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress’s “power of the purse”, and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as

if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(9) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(10) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(11) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

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

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country’s fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unem-

ployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual’s job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country’s economic outlook. 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. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country’s standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a “crowding out” of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country’s standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(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 will 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 helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 804. 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 United States 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) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. 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 highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

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

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(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 can reach nearly 45 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 slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. 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 United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States 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 about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this

level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their retirement and their children's education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

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

(17) 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. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform 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 and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

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

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers

and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to "hollow out" United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biologic medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medicines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a "tax loophole," cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(11) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

SEC. 806. 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 nearly 23 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 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 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 CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 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 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission” which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) 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 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 should, 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 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President should 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 should 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 should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

(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.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

(1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(2) prevents a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;

(3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and

(4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

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

(1) The President’s health care law put Washington’s priorities first, and not patients’. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family’s health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged “If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan.” Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President’s health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President’s health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President’s most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual “mandate” could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies’ religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President’s administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President’s health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts

patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSABILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insurance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for

their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 808. 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 Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

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

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(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) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations 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;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

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

SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.

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

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outpace the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.

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

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

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

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

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

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: "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 now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, 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 2017 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 \$5,775 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 on-line coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the "high-risk" list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans' Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America's veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.

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

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full

scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The "accrual method" of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the "cash method" records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

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

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary

resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct out-year budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED 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 its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could "lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings."

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

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

(C) twenty 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) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage "green building" in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. 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.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) 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.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should 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.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(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 canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should 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 continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

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

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—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.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON "NO BUDGET, NO PAY".

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.

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

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities".

(4) The President's fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) **POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.**—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated \$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House

Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151 billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) **DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.**—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) **SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.**—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Federal Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment labeled Price 2 is an important amendment, important substitute. It is important for our colleagues, it is important for the Members of this Chamber, and it is important for the American people to know the differences between this amendment and the substitute amendment that we just talked about.

There are two changes in this amendment, two changes in this substitute. This is an important debate. The first change is that, in this substitute, we increase global war on terror spending from \$94 billion in fiscal year 2016 to \$96 billion in 2016, an increase of \$2 billion in the global war on terror. The second change from the underlying resolution is that we remove the requirement for an offset of any of the funding in the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, this is an absolutely vital substitute amendment so that the

House can work its will, so that the Members of the conference are able to stipulate and say what they believe is to be most appropriate. Regardless, the level of spending for defense is north of the President's. The level of spending for defense when you look at base spending and global war on terror spending is where it needs to be to assist our men and women in accomplishing the mission.

So, significant changes, yes, but changes in a positive direction to be able to make certain that this House is able to adopt a budget, work with the Senate to come forward with a unified budget. So I am pleased to offer what has become known as Price 2.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that the Republican budget uses games and gimmicks that would make Enron accountants blush with respect to their basic budget. It is not just me who says that. People, independent observers from all over the country have said that. USA Today is not a partisan newspaper. Here is what they said about the Republican budget quackery: But "pretend" is the operative word because the Republicans supposed path to balance is fanciful at best. That is USA Today.

Now, why do they say that? They say that because Republicans claim in the ninth and tenth years of their budget that they have this balance, but their budget depends on revenue from the Affordable Care Act. That is the ObamaCare that they say they are repealing. It depends on savings from the Affordable Care Act. It assumes that the costs of the tax cuts that this body is enacting by the day—for corporations and very wealthy individuals, mostly—aren't happening; right? That is a whole different universe. In fact, as we heard today, they just passed, worked on a bill in the Committee on Ways and Means, they are marking it up, \$280 billion more to the deficit for the benefit of 5,500 American families, 75 percent of whom have \$20 million-plus estates.

So their budget accounting is all wrong. In my view, their priorities and values are all wrong, too. But that same phony accounting that they are using for their big budget, now they are doing it to the defense budget as well. They are pretending that we need more in the overseas contingency account than the military leadership says it needs. In fact, they have been here testifying, saying that that is the wrong way to go. And yes, last year, as I read earlier, Republicans said the same thing in the Committee on the Budget report. They said that doing what Republicans are doing in this

amendment is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process. I didn't write that. Former chairman of the Committee on the Budget PAUL RYAN wrote that. So we have got budget quackery in the main part of the budget, and now we have got games with defense spending. That is just the beginning of the story because, despite all that quackery and not balancing, what they do is hit hard at working families in America.

We have had this debate now over the last 2 days. The good news with the economy is things are getting better; more people are getting back to work. We have got a long way to go, but trends are good; yet people are working harder than ever and feel like they are running in place, and some falling behind, and this Republican budget just makes it harder on them. In fact, it eliminates the college tax deduction, gets rid of the bump-up in the child tax credit, and gets rid of all the Affordable Care tax credits that help people afford health care. In fact, the irony is they keep the parts of the Affordable Care Act that raise revenue and get rid of the parts of the Affordable Care Act that help people afford health insurance. What a deal.

So it is an unfortunate day for the country, Mr. Chairman, and I think Members, when they look at this, will recognize that the Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his leadership and for the hard work of his entire committee. When we talk about this budget that is on the floor, I rise in strong support of this budget that restores fiscal sanity back to Washington.

If you talk about one of the greatest threats facing our Nation right now, it is the fact that out-of-control spending and the lack of ability to set priorities and make those tough decisions to get our economy moving again have held our economy back, and it has also held back the opportunities for so many young people that deserve the same opportunity to achieve the American Dream that we and every generation that has come before us have been able to achieve.

□ 1715

And so, Mr. Chairman, what is so important about this budget is not just the fact that we get back to balance within 10 years. Balancing the Federal budget—we can do it. We actually lay it out in this budget. But it is all of the underlying policies, the great reforms that have been so desperately needed by Washington for so long, actually confronting challenges facing our country in a way that puts us on a path to get the economy moving again.

Let's talk about Medicare. Medicare is on a path to bankruptcy, Mr. Chairman. And what is so important with this budget is we actually lay out a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy and strengthen it for future generations. That is in this budget.

We repeal the President's health care law, ObamaCare, something that has cost millions of people the good health care they like. It caused doctors to leave the practice of medicine and killed jobs across this country.

We lay out the process for tax reform. We lay out really good reforms that people have been asking Washington to make. These are things that families have been doing for years, sitting around the kitchen table, making the tough decisions to ultimately live within their means and make sure that they can go forward and provide better opportunities for their children. That is what this budget does.

And let's contrast that, Mr. Chairman, to President Obama's budget. President Obama lays out a budget that never, ever gets to balance. And not only that, he adds another \$2.1 trillion in new taxes, taxes that will kill economic growth even more and that will take jobs out of this country and ship them overseas.

The President always talks about raising taxes on people as if it is the only way to balance the budget. I would think the President's budget, with those new taxes, would get to balance in 2 or 3 years. Yet his budget never gets to balance.

We don't raise a dime in new taxes in our budget. We just empower American people again. We let families have control over their health care decisions again. And with that empowerment, we get to balance in less than 10 years.

This is the direction we need to head for our country, Mr. Chairman. This is the reason we all came here to Washington, to tackle the big problems in a way that restores opportunities for all Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

We have heard that, despite all these claims, the Republican budget doesn't balance. I just read from USA Today. They don't have a stake in this battle. They said it is "fanciful at best."

And it is interesting that if that is the number one priority of our Republican colleagues, why is it they don't cut one single special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit? Not one.

There are \$1.4 trillion a year in what the Congressional Budget Office classifies as tax expenditures. These are tax breaks. That is \$1.4 trillion a year. That is more than we spend on Social Security every year. It is more than we spend on Medicare and Medicaid combined every year. They don't cut a single one of those. Maybe it is because 17 percent of those tax breaks go to the

top 1 percent of income earners. And this is in a budget where their whole economic theory is based on the idea we are going to cut tax rates for the folks at the very top.

The Ways and Means Committee just added over \$280 billion to the deficit—or is in the process of doing it—to help 5,500 American families. So they don't cut a single tax break. In fact, they are giving bigger ones to families with estates over \$10 million, 75 percent of whom have estates over \$20 million. But they cut education. They don't fund the Veterans Administration at the level the President does this year. It is \$1.9 billion less—\$19 billion less than the President for the Veterans Administration over 10 years.

And how about the folks that are working hard every day in our veterans hospitals, those nurses, Federal employees? How about the Border Control Agents? How about the FBI? How about the folks in the intelligence community who helped track down Obama bin Laden? How about all of them?

You know what the big thank you to them is? They cut Federal employee pay by 5 percent. They don't want to do that in a straightforward manner either. Here is how they do it. They are going to require all those Federal employees to put about 5 percent more into their pension without increasing the pension by a penny. That is what they do.

Thank you. Thank you to the folks who are taking care of veterans in those hospitals. Thank you to folks in the foreign service who are putting their lives at risk. A lot of those people in the foreign service have given their lives overseas for this country.

The big thank you from the Republican budget is not just no COLA. It is cut by 5½ percent, effectively, in a budget that doesn't cut a single tax break, where 17 percent of those tax breaks go to the folks at the very top, where a lot of those tax breaks are in this Tax Code because someone had a powerful lobbyist who got them a special break that is not available for other Americans.

This budget is wrong for America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the misinformation and outright errors are phenomenal. The fact of the matter is the gentleman knows that it is the Ways and Means Committee that handles tax reform. It is not the Budget Committee. What we do is lay out a path to be able to allow the Ways and Means Committee to come up with a positive, pro-growth tax reform. That is the plan that is laid out in this budget.

I would be so concerned about the gentleman's comments about getting to balance—I don't buy a thing that he is saying about our balance because we do get to balance within less than 10 years by reducing spending by \$5.5 trillion. I would be concerned about his

statements if I believed for one second that the other side thought that getting to balance was even important. The fact of the matter is that they don't. In fact, their budget never, ever, ever gets to balance, nor does the President's. So the crocodile tears that I see on the other side about us allegedly not getting to balance just is absolutely not credible.

And what we request of Federal employees is that they be treated exactly like folks in the private sector. That is what the American people think is fair, appropriate treatment for all Americans, not favorite treatment, not picking winners and losers, like the other side enjoys doing.

I am so proud now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), who is the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, a gentleman with whom I have worked closely over these last 10 or 11 weeks on this budget and for whom I have the utmost respect for his positive contributions to our Conference and to our Nation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I want to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee not only for yielding, but for all of his work in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I spent some time on the Budget Committee. Putting a budget together is never easy. And I believe that the committee has done excellent work in putting together a budget that, as the whip just described, helps increase economic opportunity for the whole country.

I particularly appreciate the chairman as he has had to navigate through a variety of interests and a variety of concerns in putting that budget together.

I know firsthand that Chairman PRICE and other members of the committee are very concerned about national security. And so I want to take a moment to explain why I believe the amendment we are considering now, Price 2, is better than Price 1 when it comes to national security. I think Members deserve that explanation.

The amount of funding that the President has asked for our military this year ends up being \$612 billion when you add the base and the overseas contingency account or the global war on terrorism account, whichever you want to call it. When you add them together, it is \$612 billion.

All of our military leaders have testified that that is the lower ragged edge of what it takes to defend the country, and my opinion is that it would be rather reckless of us to ignore those warnings and do less. Now, I am for more than the lower ragged edge, but that is a base minimum, at least, that our military leaders have said is required.

So if you look at Price 1, it has \$613 billion. But the problem I have is that \$20-something billion of that is conditional upon, first, the House and the Senate and President Obama reaching agreement on how to fund the reserve

fund before the military can spend that money.

Now, we have a track record here, and I am not at all convinced that President Obama really wants to find those savings. And if that happens, then that reserve fund is never funded, and we don't have the \$20 billion.

Price 2, on the other hand, fully funds that military up to that basic minimum level, and there is still a reserve fund.

So, if there can be an agreement that reduces the deficit, I am for it. I have no doubt I will vote for it. But it doesn't make our equipping, training of our military dependent upon doing that first. And it just seems to me it would be hard to look a spouse or a parent in the eye and say: Oh, we can only train your son or daughter for the mission they are about to be sent on conditional upon this reserve fund being funded.

Now, I think that there have been several misconceptions that are going around. Price 2, the budget before us, still balances in 10 years. Removing that condition does not change that in any way.

Our committee, the Armed Services Committee, is going to authorize the overseas contingency account just like we authorize the base account. And that is different from what happened before. But we are going to do it program by program, just like we do the base.

So, some notion that there is a giant slush fund out there so the Pentagon can do what they want is just not true. It is going to be authorized and appropriated program by program just like the base budget is.

I think Members ought to know that our committee, on a bipartisan basis, is absolutely committed to reforms to make sure that we all get value for the money we spend for everything in defense. The same is true on the other side of the Capitol as well.

We hear that it would be better to put this money in the base—and that is right, it would be better—but the problem is the law of sequestration can't be fixed in a budget. We have got to live under the law as it is now.

Now, I would like to change that law. I would like to remove the cap on defense spending because it turns out there is no cap on the dangers that we are facing around the world. But in the meantime, we have got to live under the law.

The way to do that is to increase the OCO fund. And really, if we authorized and appropriated, it doesn't really matter what we call those funds. It still meets that minimum threshold that the President and the military leaders have said is necessary.

Let me make one other point. I am concerned that the President is going to try to use defense spending as a hostage to force increased spending in other areas or higher taxes. And I think that we need to say right now that is absolutely wrong.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THORNBERRY. It is important for the House and it is especially important for the Commander in Chief to fully fund our military without conditions and not try to use it as leverage for other parts of his political agenda.

I hope Members will vote for Price 2 and for the final budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman just recognized, this is a huge departure from the way this House of Representatives has dealt with our military spending in the past. In fact, it is a departure that the Republican-controlled Budget Committee said violated the integrity of the process.

The Budget Committee specifically said it would oppose increases above the levels the administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations. That is what the Budget Committee said last year—Republicans. This year, forget it. Just have some amnesia. Let's play games with our defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to an issue that has come up a couple of times during this debate regarding economic growth.

As I said, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the Republican budget will actually slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. Just after we are regaining momentum, they are going to slow it down.

The Congressional Budget Office said something else that is interesting. It says, as you look ahead over the next 10 years, the biggest single factor with respect to growth rates that don't keep up with the past averages are demographic changes; the fact that baby boomers are going to be retiring, and they are not going to be in the workforce. You just have to look at the CBO report from this budget year.

So, you would think that one way to deal with that would be to pass immigration reform.

□ 1730

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says that that will help spur economic growth. It will also help add to the solvency of Social Security because you will have more workers today supporting the baby boomers who are retiring over the next couple of years.

If you really want a progrowth budget, you would support the Democratic approach that provides help to struggling families working every day, invest in our future by investing in our kids' education, and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

There was a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate last year. Over here in the House, what happened to it? It is not that there was a vote on it and it went down. We never even had a vote here in this body on comprehensive im-

migration reform, one of the things that the budget pros and the economists say could help spur our economy in the years ahead, something that is supported by the Chamber of Commerce, as well as folks in the labor community.

No, Republicans didn't want to do that. They didn't even allow a vote on that bill here in the House of Representatives. That would have been a progrowth effort, too.

Mr. Chairman, instead of those progrowth efforts, efforts that will help shore up Social Security, all we get is the same old-same old, another budget that refuses to cut a single special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, provides more tax breaks for folks at the top, and is based on a failed theory of top-down/trickle-down economics. We can do a lot better.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to what amount of time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially to Chairman PRICE, for his work.

Budgets are never easy. Lots of times, some don't even bring a budget to the floor, and I want to thank you for your work, and thank you to everybody else.

Also, I know the work is hard on the other side of the aisle. I may not agree with your argument, and part of me feels sorry for you that nobody else in your conference is down here to even join you, but you are making the fight by yourself very strongly, and I thank the gentleman for that. This is a body to debate, and I thank you for filling the time.

Today, the House will adopt a budget. A budget is a vision for the future, and Republicans are making our vision very clear. In our vision, Washington lives within its means. In our vision, we don't raise taxes on the American people. In our vision, we set the stage for a strong American future.

Our vision looks to the road ahead, not to the rear view behind us. We face many challenges here at home and abroad, but we can tackle those challenges and create a more prosperous America if we choose a better path. This budget is a better path.

Today, we look forward to a simpler and fairer tax code. Today, we look forward to an end of ObamaCare. Today, we look forward to saving our children and grandchildren from reckless spending by balancing the budget in less than 10 years. Today, we start growing America's economy, not Washington's. That is the big contrast between what

the Republican and Democrats have to offer.

You see, the Democrats continue to call for higher taxes, more spending, and more debt. In fact, the Democrats' budget has all the same tax increases that President Obama's budget has, but I want to give them credit—at least they actually submitted a budget this year.

You see, it was only in 2010 when the Democrats became the very first majority party since the Budget Act of 1974 had passed, when they didn't even offer a budget here, when they were in the majority, let alone get one out of committee. I think the American public saw their vision and made a change in who was the majority after that.

At least the President has actually submitted a budget every year, eventually; he did that, but just like the Democrats' budgets, none of the President's budgets even balanced. They didn't balance in 10; they didn't balance in 100 years.

His budgets, the President's, Mr. Chairman, has been so bad that altogether, on this floor, he has only gotten two votes in the House for his entire Presidency. I understand why my friend on the other side of the aisle has more difficulty with those coming down to join him.

While Republicans are attacking the debt seriously, the President and the congressional Democrats are not. Their budgets, in my view, are propaganda, not a path to the future. To get a better future, Republicans understand that we have to make tough choices, choices today to create opportunities for us tomorrow.

You see, I believe the best days are in front of us. We are an exceptional nation. We are too strong and too good to ever be kept down. Sometimes, we might have leadership in the White House that doesn't want to make the tough choices, but Americans are remarkably resilient, and America will always be better than our faults.

America is an idea, and as long as we have the wisdom to listen, but the courage to lead, that idea will never fail. I ask my Members to join with me, and I hope my talk today helped my friend on the other side get some others to join him.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, to the Republican leader, let me just say I think there is a lot of confusion on the Republican side. This is the first time since I have been on the Budget Committee that we have had two official Republican budgets on the floor of the House. That is a little bit of confusion here.

I am really pleased to be joined by super-reinforcements, a gentlewoman who understands that we power our economy by making sure we have an economy that works for all people, not just folks at the very top; that economic growth is based on an economy where hard work translates into higher incomes for everybody; and that we have a tax system that rewards work,

not one riddled with tax breaks where 17 percent of those tax breaks goes to the top 1 percent.

That is a tax code written by lobbyists. We want a tax code that is fair to the American people and the American worker.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I say with great pride how impressed all of us are by his statement of values that he has put forth in this House Democratic budget; the breadth of knowledge, the depth of commitment, the vision for a strong way to keep America number one.

Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and thank you to members of the House Budget Committee.

We say it all the time. A budget should be a statement of our values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in how we allocate our resources.

Are we allocating them as investments in the future, the education of our children, the building of our infrastructure, to promote commerce, to protect the environment, to improve the quality of life of all Americans? Or is it a budget that subscribes to trickle-down economics of the Republican Party, which have never been successful for America's hard-working families?

Instead, we have a budget that subscribes to what President Obama spoke about in the State of the Union Address: middle class economics. That is a better set of values to build a strong and prosperous future for America that is reflected in the House Democratic budget, but, as I said, this budget should be a statement of our values.

And I just ask you, Mr. Chairman—I am allowed to ask our colleagues—is that correct, Mr. Chairman?—to address a comment?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman's remarks must be addressed to the Chair.

Ms. PELOSI. Okay. So you are the one, Mr. Chair.

For you and for all you represent, I ask you: Do you think it is a statement of values of the American people to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country while increasing taxes on the middle class by around \$2,000?

We don't begrudge the wealthy their success and their achievement; but why should people come forth and say we are going to balance our budget by giving tax increases to the middle class and tax decreases to the very wealthy?

By the way, it doesn't balance the budget. The Republican budgets are not balanced.

Is it a statement of value to end the boost in child tax credit; end higher education tax credit; freeze Pell grants for 10 years, thereby curbing the opportunity for people not only to reach their fulfillment, but for our country

to be competitive and keep America number one?

It is not just about personal aspirations. That would be reason enough. This is also about keeping America number one because we know that innovation begins in the classroom. If we want to have great innovation, we have to have access to education to many more people; then again, this budget—the Republican budget—does not invest in innovation in any way.

Is it a statement of value to say to seniors we are now going to end your Medicare guarantee and focus on for you to pay more for preventive care and high prescription drug costs, instead of keeping what we have now—which is free preventive care for seniors—and reducing their prescription drug care?

Infrastructure—the Republican budget abandons the Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$187 billion, or more than 19 percent, from transportation funding over the coming decades. How could that be a statement of values when we are not building the infrastructure of our country?

By the way, infrastructure and transportation have, in years past, not been partisan issues. This is the place where you come together because it made all the sense in the world to build the infrastructure of America, to know that no maintenance is the most expensive maintenance.

Their bill, it is just stunning to see that, once again, the Republican budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. Now, mind you, the Affordable Care Act has nearly \$1 trillion in savings. They take the savings and spend it on other things like tax cuts for the rich, but they repeal the bill. It just doesn't make any sense at all. I just don't understand how you can't see that that doesn't add up.

This budget savages the investments needed to keep America number one in the global economy with even deeper cuts than the already devastating sequester.

I know that, if you are sitting at home and watching this on TV, you are thinking: What does this mean to me?

Well, what this means to you is that this is a budget that—our House Democratic budget works for hard-working Americans, making it easier to own a home, easier to send a child to college, easier to have a secure and enjoyable retirement. Even if your child does not want to go to college, you can enable your child to reach his or her aspirations because of your own financial security.

For us to achieve a bright and durable future for our country, we must embrace the fact that financial security of our working families is both the measure and the engine of our Nation's success.

Democrats are proud to offer a budget that grows opportunity, prosperity, and dignity for every American, not just the wealthy and the well connected.

It is time for Republicans to abandon their fuzzy math and their broken priorities and come together with Democrats to pass a budget dedicated to the future of hard-working American families.

□ 1745

I think that is what we all came here to do, Democrats and Republicans, but you would never know it to see not one but two of the Republican budgets they have put forth today.

That is why I am so proud of the work of the House Budget members on the Democratic side. That is why I commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for his superior work on this subject and for having a budget that reflects the values of the American people for a brighter future.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, as Leader PELOSI just said, this really comes down to what vision you have for what has helped power our economy.

The Republican theory of the case is that our economy is powered by providing tax rate cuts to people at the very high end of the income scale and somehow the benefits of that will trickle down and lift everybody up. The problem with that theory is it already crashed in the real world. Right in the early 2000s, that is what President Bush did. Incomes for folks at the top went up even more, but everybody else was running aground, running in place, or falling behind.

That is why we presented a budget based on an economy that accelerates because more Americans are able to make bigger paychecks through harder work, and that is why we proposed to change the Tax Code from one that is currently skewed and tilted in favor of unearned income and simply making money off of money and against people who make money off of hard work.

Why is the Tax Code skewed that way today? Probably because a lot of people who could afford to pay a lot of wealthy lobbyists made it that way.

Yet the Republican budget doesn't close a single tax break for the purposes of reducing the deficit—not corporate jets, not the tax provisions that perversely encourage American companies to move jobs and capital overseas. We proposed to close those tax loopholes and bring those jobs and that capital back here to the United States to help power our economy, not the economies of our global economic competitors.

So I hope that this Congress will reject a view of the economy that is based on the idea that everyone can only do well when the folks at the top get a tax cut as opposed to an economy where we are all in it together.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, my friend on the other side talks about the two budgets that we have before us, and I would remind him, as the majority leader did, about the debacle of 2010 when no budget came. So we would say that two budgets are better than none.

I continue to be saddened, though, by the politics of division of our friends on the other side, dividing Americans, pitting Americans one against the other. In order for their vision to be true, one would have to believe that the government doesn't take enough of the American people's money and that the government isn't big enough. Those are the things you have to believe to believe that their vision is correct.

Let me set the record straight on a couple of items that have just been brought up:

One, our budget allows for over \$300 billion in spending on innovation and research over the next 10 years. Our budget provides for a Medicare program that is guaranteed for all seniors, and with greater choices for those seniors. Our budget provides for a path in terms of infrastructure to actually find real money for transportation, not just painting a rosy picture for folks. And our budget believes that health care ought to be controlled by patients and families and doctors, not by Washington, D.C.

What we do is responsibly lay out a plan for a healthy economy, an opportunity economy, one that opens doors for people, doesn't subject them to the dictates of Washington, D.C. You see, we believe in America, and we believe in Americans—all Americans.

We understand our problems are significant. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman. We hear the people of this Nation crying out, crying out for leadership here in Washington.

This Balanced Budget for a Stronger America will result in a government that is more efficient and more effective and more accountable, one that frees up the American spirit, that of optimism and enthusiasm to do great things and to meet great challenges.

I ask my colleagues for their strong support for this Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage a "yes" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I come to the floor to speak in ardent opposition to the Republican Budget. This budget fails to deliver for the majority of hard-working Americans, many of whom are scraping by, living paycheck to paycheck. The House Republican budget would bring us back to the same top-down economics that have failed time and time again—tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, while slashing investments in the middle class.

The GOP budget significantly undermines the economic and health security of the people of Texas. In the state of Texas alone the proposed budget would place an unnecessary economic burden on seniors by increasing the cost of prescriptions in the future and eliminating guaranteed access to Medicare. Al-

though statistics show that the Affordable Care Act is working through the 16 million Americans that have gained coverage, the GOP budget would eliminate coverage for more than 1.2 million Texans receiving coverage through the marketplace.

The House Republican budget ransacks our nation's commitment to education—the foundation for economic opportunity and a successful future—with severe cuts in elementary and secondary education and early learning programs, including measures which make college less affordable for millions of students who rely on Pell Grants, federal student loans, and higher education tax credits.

In addition to students, the proposed Republican budget threatens workers, women and children. Under the Republican budget, middle class families will see higher taxes and millions will see fewer jobs. The last thing that hard-working Texas families can afford right now is higher taxes, fewer jobs and less growth. This budget would cut our investments in our nation's R&D and innovation enterprise—the investments that have allowed us to be a world leader in these fields. If we short-change those accounts in an attempt to cut a few more dollars from the deficit over the short-term, the reality is that we will wind up shortchanging our future economy and quality of life for decades to come.

We need a better plan and a better set of values to build a strong and prosperous America. I support a budget that would aid the American people by advancing our healthcare system, securing a pathway to proper funding for medical advancements and ensuring affordable healthcare for all. I support a budget that values the future of America's role in STEM advancements through technological innovation and scientific research. I support a budget that would lower taxes for working families and students; and a budget that would make sound investments in programs like Head Start. I support a budget that would reinvigorate our infrastructure through highway and mass transit planning and investment. As it stands, the Republican budget does not bring all of these options to the table.

Though we may not always agree, as lawmakers, we must set aside our own political agendas by joining together to pass legislation that benefits all Americans. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in strong opposition to the Republican Budget, and instead to support the President's FY16 and to commit to more robust investments in our future economic prosperity.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, our national debt continues to pose a serious threat to our future economic growth and national security. If we fail to act, these threats will grow and the risk to our country will be far greater.

Like so many American households know all too well, balancing a budget is never easy. The budget process requires us to make a number of hard choices between priorities we all support. However, there is no doubt that if we fail to make these difficult decisions today, we will face even more ominous options in the years ahead.

If we followed President Obama's budget plan that's exactly where it would take us—more spending, more debt, and more kicking the can down the road. That's not leadership.

Thankfully, House Republicans have chosen to once again pursue a responsible path that leads to a truly balanced budget. I want to ap-

plaud Budget Committee Chairman TOM PRICE and the rest of our colleagues on the committee for drafting a budget that cuts more than \$5 trillion in spending and balances the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes.

The House budget will enhance our economic future by calling for a fairer, simpler tax code and repealing the job-killing provisions in ObamaCare, including its taxes, regulations and mandates. The plan promotes freedom of choice, affordability, and patient-centered health care solutions.

In order to protect our national security, the House budget will ensure necessary funding is provided for troop training, equipment and compensation. Defense spending under the plan will be greater than the level proposed in the President's budget and will ensure readiness. The budget also includes provisions that will improve the efficiency in the Defense Department, including the civilian workforce. Specifically, the budget contains language that echoes the REDUCE Act, legislation that I have introduced that would require any reductions in military end strength be accompanied by appropriate reductions in the civilian workforce in order to maintain a ratio that more closely resembles the historical average.

There's no question that the House budget requires a number of sacrifices, but American families make and live with similar sacrifices every day and they expect our government to do the same. President Obama may not understand that, but I do and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the House Republican budget and its path towards a brighter economic future and a more secure America.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-49 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 319, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—105

Allen	Grothman	Poliquin
Amash	Hardy	Posey
Barton	Harris	Price, Tom
Benishkek	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Black	Hill	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Blum	Huelskamp	Rokita
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Roskam
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rothfus
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Royce
Carter (GA)	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Jenkins (KS)	Salmon
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Schock
Coffman	King (IA)	Schweikert
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lance	Sessions
DeSantis	Latta	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Stutzman
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Walden
Fincher	Meadows	Walker
Fleischmann	Messer	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Womack
Gosar	Newhouse	Woodall
Gowdy	Palmer	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Perry	Yoho
Griffith	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)

NOES—319

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Farr
Adams	Clay	Fattah
Aderholt	Cleaver	Fitzpatrick
Aguilar	Clyburn	Fleming
Amodei	Cohen	Flores
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Babin	Comstock	Fortenberry
Barletta	Conaway	Foster
Barr	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Conyers	Franks (AZ)
Beatty	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Cooper	Fudge
Bera	Costa	Gabbard
Beyer	Costello (PA)	Gallego
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Garamendi
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gibbs
Blumenauer	Crawford	Gibson
Bonamici	Crenshaw	Graham
Bost	Crowley	Granger
Boustany	Culberson	Graves (LA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Graves (MO)
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bridenstine	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	DeGette	Guinta
Brown (FL)	Delaney	Guthrie
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Buck	DelBene	Hahn
Bucshon	Denham	Hanna
Bustos	Dent	Harper
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Hartzler
Byrne	Deutch	Hastings
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Capps	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Capuano	Doggett	Heck (WA)
Cardenas	Higgin	Higgins
Carney	Dold	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Holding
Carter (TX)	Duckworth	Honda
Cartwright	Edwards	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Hunter
Chu, Judy	Engel	Hurd (TX)
Ciilline	Eshoo	Israel
Clark (MA)	Esty	Jackson Lee
	Farenthold	Jeffries
		Jenkins (WV)

Johnson (GA)	McSally	Schakowsky
Johnson (OH)	Meehan	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Schrader
Jolly	Meng	Scott (VA)
Jones	Mica	Scott, Austin
Joyce	Miller (FL)	Scott, David
Kaptur	Miller (MI)	Serrano
Katko	Moore	Sherman
Keating	Moulton	Shimkus
Kelly (IL)	Mullin	Shuster
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (FL)	Simpson
Kennedy	Murphy (PA)	Sinema
Kildee	Nadler	Sires
Kilmer	Napolitano	Slaughter
Kind	Neal	Smith (MO)
King (NY)	Noem	Smith (NJ)
Kinzinger (IL)	Nolan	Smith (TX)
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Speier
Kline	Nugent	Stefanik
Knight	Nunes	Stewart
Kuster	Olson	Stivers
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)
Lamborn	Pallone	Takai
Langevin	Pascrell	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Paulsen	Thompson (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
Lawrence	Pelosi	Thompson (PA)
Lee	Perlmutter	Thornberry
Levin	Peters	Titus
Lewis	Peterson	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Torres
Lipinski	Pittenger	Tsongas
LoBiondo	Pitts	Turner
Loeb	Pocan	Upton
Loeb	Polis	Valadao
Lofgren	Pompeo	Van Hollen
Long	Price (NC)	Vargas
Love	Quigley	Veasey
Lowenthal	Rangel	Vela
Lowe	Reed	Velázquez
Lucas	Reichert	Visclosky
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Renacci	Wagner
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Rice (NY)	Walberg
Lynch	Richmond	Walorski
MacArthur	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Maloney	Roby	Walz
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (AL)	Wasserman
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Schultz
Massie	Rooney (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
McCarthy	Ross	Welch
McCaul	Rouzer	Wenstrup
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Williams
McGovern	Rush	Wilson (FL)
McHenry	Russell	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
McMorris	Sánchez, Linda T.	Yarmuth
Rodgers	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (AK)
McNerney	Sarbanes	Young (IN)
	Scalise	Zeldin
		Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1816

Messrs. WALZ, JEFFRIES, FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. MULLIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WALDEN, ROSKAM, BISHOP of Michigan, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, TROTT, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 208, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—219

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Pompeo
Aderholt	Grothman	Posey
Allen	Guinta	Price, Tom
Amodei	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Babin	Hanna	Reed
Barletta	Hardy	Reichert
Barr	Harper	Renacci
Barton	Hartzler	Ribble
Benishkek	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rigell
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Black	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hudson	Rokita
Boehner	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney (FL)
Bost	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Boustany	Hurd (TX)	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Brat	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Bridenstine	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Buchanan	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Bucshon	Joyce	Salmon
Burgess	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Byrne	King (IA)	Scalise
Calvert	King (NY)	Schock
Carter (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Klaine	Sessions
Chabot	Knight	Shimkus
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Shuster
Clawson (FL)	Lamborn	Simpson
Coffman	Lance	Smith (MO)
Cole	Latta	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Love	Stefanik
Cook	Lucas	Stewart
Costello (PA)	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Cramer	Lummis	Stutzman
Crenshaw	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Culberson	Marchant	Thornberry
Curbelo (FL)	Marino	Tiberi
Davis, Rodney	McCarthy	Tipton
Denham	McCaul	Trott
Dent	McHenry	Turner
DeSantis	McMorris	Upton
DesJarlais	Rodgers	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	Dold	Wagner
Dold	Duffy	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Mica	Walden
Duncan (TN)	Miller (FL)	Walker
Ellmers (NC)	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Emmer (MN)	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Neugebauer	Westerman
Fleming	Newhouse	Westmoreland
Flores	Noem	Whitfield
Forbes	Nugent	Williams
Fortenberry	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Olson	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Palazzo	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Palmer	Yoder
Gibbs	Paulsen	Yoho
Gohmert	Pearce	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Perry	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Pittenger	Young (IN)
Granger	Pitts	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Poe (TX)	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Poliquin	

NOES—208

Adams	Beatty	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Becerra	Bonamici
Amash	Bera	Boyle, Brendan F.
Ashford	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Bishop (GA)	

Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Nadler
Buck	Harris	Napolitano
Bustos	Hastings	Neal
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Nolan
Capps	Higgins	Norcross
Capuano	Himes	Pallone
Cárdenas	Honda	Pascarell
Carney	Hoyer	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Huffman	Peters
Castor (FL)	Hultgren	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Israel	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Issa	Pocan
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Polis
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cleaver	Jolly	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Jones	Richmond
Cohen	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Katko	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Keating	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cooper	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Courtney	Kilmer	T.
Crawford	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Kuster	Shakowsky
Cummings	Labrador	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lawrence	Scott, David
Delaney	Lee	Sensenbrenner
DeLauro	Levin	Serrano
DeBene	Lewis	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Deutch	Lipinski	Sires
Dingell	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Doggett	Loebsock	Speier
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
F.	Lowenthal	Takai
Duckworth	Lowe	Takano
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Eshoo	(NM)	Tonko
Esty	Lynch	Torres
Farr	Maloney,	Tsongas
Fattah	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Massie	Veasey
Fudge	Matsui	Vela
Gabbard	McClintock	Velázquez
Gallego	McCollum	Viscosky
Garamendi	McDermott	Walz
Garrett	McGovern	Wasserman
Gibson	McKinley	Schultz
Gosar	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Graham	McSally	Watson Coleman
Grayson	Meeks	Welch
Green, Al	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Moore	Woodall
Griffith	Moulton	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Mulvaney	

NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1825

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

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their work on this. Budgets aren't easy things, clearly. We have navigated some interesting times over the past couple of weeks. But I want to thank my colleagues for their wonderful and remarkable support.

I especially want to thank the staff on the Budget Committee, both the majority and the minority staff. They worked tirelessly to get these work products forward. So I just want to say before all the Members of the House of Representatives how proud I am of the staff work that has been done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I want to start by joining the chairman of the committee in thanking all Members for a vigorous debate, and especially to thank the staff of the Budget Committee.

As for the Republican budget itself, nothing has changed since we began the debate yesterday to make it any better. It is the wrong direction for America.

Madam Chair, when we gather here today, there is good news and bad news and some very bad news.

The good news is the economy has been picking up. More Americans are going back to work. Not everything is rosy. We have a long way to go, but the trends are in the right direction.

□ 1830

The bad news is that Americans are working harder than ever, but a lot of them feel like they are running in place, and many are falling behind.

This is not a new problem. It is a chronic problem. We have seen worker productivity in this country go up and up and up over the last several decades, but that additional hard work and productivity has not translated into higher wages for most working Americans. They have seen flat paychecks.

If it is not going into higher wages for most workers, where is it going? It has gone disproportionately to the folks at the very, very top. They have been doing just great, but everybody else has been falling behind.

Now, we had some good news after the election. The Speaker of this House and the Republican leader said they understood this issue. In fact, they both wrote that they were looking forward to helping struggling middle class Americans and were looking forward to dealing with wage stagnation.

The very bad news for the country, Madam Chair, is, when you look at this Republican budget, it turns out they were just kidding because this Republican budget is very hard on hard-working Americans and on those looking to find a job. It says one message: work even harder; take home even less.

It does absolutely nothing to increase the take home pay of workers or to increase their wages. It will increase the tax burden on millions of working families. Amazingly, it eliminates the college tax deduction. It increases the

costs for working Americans by getting rid of the bump up in the child tax credit. It gets rid of the rate bump up in the “make work pay” earned income tax credit.

For students, it makes college much more expensive. This Republican budget actually increases the costs of going to college. It increases the costs of student loans even as we hit over \$1 trillion in student debt. It eliminates \$90 billion worth of Pell grants.

For seniors, they will immediately see higher prescription drug costs by reopening the doughnut hole. They will immediately see higher copays for preventative care, and seniors in nursing homes will see much worse care as they cut \$900 billion from Medicaid.

Now, while this budget squeezes working families and students and seniors, it paves the way for the Romney-Ryan tax cut plan—to cut tax rates for the folks at the very top—on the theory that somehow that is going to trickle down and boost the economy. It is a theory that crashed in the real world under President Bush when incomes for folks at the top went up but when everybody else's fell behind.

While it makes life harder on working Americans right now, it also disinvests in the future of America. It dramatically cuts our investment in early education and K-12. It dramatically cuts our investment in innovation and science and research, which has helped power our economy. It assumes that the transportation trust fund will begin to run dry in a month and a half and that construction jobs will come short in a few months.

The one thing it doesn't cut is any of the special interest tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one—not for corporate jets. In fact, today, the Ways and Means Committee worked to provide a big tax break for 5,500 American families, and an average of 75 percent of them have \$20 million estates. They didn't want to touch that for the purpose of reducing the deficit, so they don't cut a single tax break.

Despite all of that disinvestment in America, here is the thing: the budget never balances; it doesn't come close.

Look at the USA Today editorial. They are not a partisan paper. They said it is pure fantasy to claim that this balances; it doesn't balance, but it does disinvest in America.

We can do a lot better. We can do a lot better than a budget that continues to rig the rules for the folks who have already made it and one that makes life harder for everybody else. Let's reject this Republican budget, and let's get started back to work for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, it has been said that budgets are about visions and that they are moral documents, and they are.

What is our vision? We believe in promoting the greatest amount of opportunity and the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans so that the greatest number of

American dreams can be realized and doing so in a way that demonstrates real hope and real compassion and real fairness without Washington's picking winners and losers.

Many of our friends here on this floor have talked about budgets being moral documents, and they are. Let me ask, Madam Chair: Where is the morality in trapping disadvantaged people in a web of welfare programs that discourage self-sufficiency and, instead, shackle them to government dependency?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in committing retirees to a health coverage program that is going bankrupt and that can't keep its promises if its so-called protectors keep blocking reform?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in forcing low-income people into second rate health programs in which many can't get appointments and in which doctors are grossly under-reimbursed by the government?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in stifling medical innovation and preventing new treatments from reaching patients because of ever-expanding Washington bureaucracy and red tape?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in tying college students to years of crippling debt because of a government-run program loan that drives up tuitions?

Where is the morality in heaping trillions of dollars of debt onto future generations to finance today's government spending because today's policymakers refuse to stop overspending?

Those are only a few examples of the regrettable consequences of well-intentioned, government-sponsored compassion. This Republican budget aims to break that pattern. It is not about cutting programs. It is about saving and strengthening programs to ensure a sustainable safety net for those who need it while encouraging and helping others to sustain themselves, the most truly compassionate thing that one can do for another. That is the morality of this budget.

What does this budget do? It balances in less than 10 years without raising taxes. It reduces spending by over \$5.5 trillion. It repeals ObamaCare and the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It ensures a strong defense.

It makes sure that we save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. We restore federalism and provide greater opportunity and greater choices for individuals in our States across this Nation, and we cut waste and corporate welfare.

These are positive solutions for the American people. A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage a "yes" vote so we can get the economy rolling again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. Hardworking American families are in deep trouble. Their wages have been stagnant or in decline for 30 years. Their jobs have been sent overseas by bad trade deals. They have seen none of the

benefit of the economic recovery. These families are struggling to put bread on their tables and heat their homes, let alone take a vacation or start a college fund. Many are just one big expense away from disaster.

We should be working to support these families, and make sure that they do not fall deeper into poverty. Instead, this radical and regressive budget would pull the rug out from under them.

It would cut \$1.8 trillion from Medicaid, and rob 14 million people of their coverage. It would turn the whole program into a block grant, leaving millions of families in limbo

It would repeal the Affordable Care Act, increasing by millions the number of uninsured people in this country.

It would partly privatize Medicare, allowing private insurers to cherry pick healthy seniors and leaving the rest of the program in ruins.

It would block-grant the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, reducing benefits and barring access to this lifeline for millions of people.

It would freeze the maximum Pell grant, denying low-income students a chance at college just as they need it more than ever to get into the middle class.

All this at a time when we are spending close to \$1.5 trillion every year on tax breaks and loopholes—much of it directed toward the wealthy and special interests. That is the spending we should be going after.

Hardworking Americans need our help. After years of neglect, we should be investing in them once more. Instead, this budget leaves them out in the cold. We cannot allow this to happen. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 163, amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 6, offered by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, is finally adopted and shall be reported to the House.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and, pursuant to House Resolution 163, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on H. Con. Res. 27 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Griffith	Poliquin
Aderholt	Grothman	Pompeo
Allen	Guinta	Posey
Amodei	Guthrie	Price, Tom
Babin	Hanna	Ratcliffe
Barletta	Hardy	Reed
Barr	Harper	Reichert
Barton	Harris	Renacci
Benishek	Hartzler	Ribble
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Rigell
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Boustany	Hultgren	Rooney (FL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Roskam
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Royce
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Byrne	Jordan	Salmon
Calvert	Joyce	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Schock
Chabot	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Sessions
Clawson (FL)	Kline	Shimkus
Coffman	Knight	Shuster
Cole	LaMalfa	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Lance	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Long	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Cramer	Love	Stewart
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stivers
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Curbelo (FL)	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Thornberry
Denham	Marchant	Tiberi
Dent	Marino	Tipton
DeSantis	McCarthy	Trott
DesJarlais	McCauley	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Upton
Dold	McHenry	Valadao
Duffy	McMorris	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	Rodgers	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Meadows	Walden
Ellmers (NC)	Meehan	Walker
Emmer (MN)	Messer	Walorski
Farenthold	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Fleming	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Flores	Mullin	Westmoreland
Forbes	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Neugebauer	Williams
Fox	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Noem	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Nugent	Womack
Garrett	Nunes	Woodall
Gibbs	Olson	Yoder
Gohmert	Palazzo	Yoho
Goodlatte	Palmer	Young (AK)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Pearce	Young (IN)
Granger	Perry	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Pittenger	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Pitts	
Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)	

NAYS—199

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright
Aguilar	F.	Castor (FL)
Amash	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Ashford	Brown (FL)	Chu, Judy
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Beatty	Buck	Clark (MA)
Becerra	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bera	Butterfield	Clay
Beyer	Capps	Cleaver
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clyburn
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bonamici	Carney	Comstock
	Carson (IN)	Connolly

Conyers	Jolly	Pelosi
Cooper	Jones	Perlmutter
Costa	Kaptur	Peters
Courtney	Katko	Peterson
Crawford	Keating	Pingree
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Cuellar	Kennedy	Polis
Cummings	Kildee	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kind	Rangel
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Kuster	Richmond
Delaney	Labrador	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeSaulniers	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Lee	T.
Doggett	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle, Michael	Lewis	Sarbanes
F.	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Duckworth	Lipinski	Schiff
Edwards	LoBiondo	Schrader
Ellison	Loeb	Schweikert
Engel	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Esty	Lowey	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Fattah	(NM)	Sherman
Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sires
Fudge	Lynch	Slaughter
Gabbard	Maloney,	Speier
Gallego	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Takai
Gibson	Massie	Takano
Graham	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Grayson	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Green, Al	McDermott	Titus
Green, Gene	McGovern	Tonko
Grijalva	McKinley	Torres
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Tsongas
Hahn	McSally	Van Hollen
Hastings	Meeks	Vargas
Heck (WA)	Meng	Veasey
Higgins	Moore	Vela
Himes	Moulton	Velázquez
Honda	Mulvaney	Visclosky
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Huelskamp	Nadler	Wasserman
Huffman	Napolitano	Schultz
Israel	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Norcross	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1854

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 27.

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

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, MEDICARE ACCESS AND CHIP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 27, 2015, THROUGH APRIL 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 173) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 27, 2015, through April 10, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Moulton.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 612

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 612.

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

SLAIN OFFICER FAMILY SUPPORT ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1527) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1527

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF THE FAMILIES OF NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT DETECTIVES WENJIAN LIU AND RAFAEL RAMOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made between January 1, 2015, and April 15, 2015, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2014, and not in 2015.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of the families of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) CLARIFICATION THAT CONTRIBUTION WILL NOT FAIL TO QUALIFY AS A CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION.—A cash contribution made for the relief of the families of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos shall not fail to be treated as a charitable contribution for purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and subsection (b) of this section merely because such contribution is for the exclusive benefit of such families. The preceding sentence shall apply to contributions made on or after December 20, 2014.

(e) CLARIFICATION THAT PAYMENTS BY CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS TO FAMILIES TREATED AS EXEMPT PAYMENTS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, payments made on or after December 20, 2014, and on or before October 15, 2015, to the spouse or any dependent (as defined in section 152 of such Code) of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu or

Rafael Ramos by an organization which (determined without regard to any such payments) would be an organization exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code shall—

(1) be treated as related to the purpose or function constituting the basis for such organization's exemption under such section, and

(2) shall not be treated as inuring to the benefit of any private individual, if such payments are made in good faith using a reasonable and objective formula which is consistently applied with respect to such Detectives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1900

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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.R. 1527, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am going to let Mr. JEFFRIES from New York explain what the bill does. This is something that I want to thank the gentleman from New York for bringing to our attention. This is the kind of thing we have done in the past under certain situations in emergencies such as this.

I would simply like to thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention, and I think Mr. JEFFRIES can explain the bill very well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me first thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership and his support in bringing this important legislation, the Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015, to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let me also thank my good friend, the lead Republican cosponsor, Representative PETER KING, for his partnership on this bill, which is of great importance to the people of New York, as well as law enforcement throughout the entire Nation.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to represent the Eighth Congressional District in New York City, proud home of the New York Police Department, one of the finest in the world.

On December 20, 2014, unspeakable tragedy struck the Bedford Stuyvesant community that I represent. While sitting in their marked patrol car, Detectives Wen Jian Liu and Rafael Ramos

were approached from behind and, without warning, assassinated at pointblank range through the passenger side window.

Liu and Ramos, both Brooklyn residents, had been assigned to patrol the Tompkins public housing development in Bedford Stuyvesant as part of a "critical-response detail" responding to an increase in violence over the previous year. They volunteered to be there as part of their willingness to protect and serve the people of New York City. They were killed simply for wearing that blue uniform.

Detective Liu, age 32, who moved to Brooklyn's Gravesend section earlier that year, was the only son of Chinese American immigrants and came to the United States with his family at the age of 12. He is survived by his parents and his new wife, whom he just married a month prior to that fateful day.

Committed to his adopted New York City, Mr. Liu was inspired to become a police officer after witnessing the attacks on September 11. After studying at both Kingsboro Community College and the College of Staten Island, he joined the auxiliary police in 2006 and in 2007 graduated from the police academy. Detective Liu served as a New York Police Department officer for 7 years.

Detective Ramos, a 2-year veteran of the NYPD, had recently celebrated his 40th birthday. He was a lifelong Brooklyn resident. He was committed to his community and active in his church in Glendale, Queens.

Rafael Ramos first served as a school safety agent before realizing his long-time dream of becoming a police officer in January 2012. He then decided that he also wanted to become a police chaplain. He spent 10 weeks studying to get his certification. His chaplain class was scheduled to graduate at 4 p.m. on the day he was killed. Detective Ramos had intended on going into full-time ministry after retiring from the New York Police Department.

He is survived by his wife and two sons, Jaden, 13, and Justin, a 19-year-old college student.

Throughout New York and across this Nation, there was an outpouring of love and support for these two men and the families that they left behind.

Under current law, individuals contributing to organizations that provide financial support to the families of the slain detectives were required to make their contributions by December 31 of last year in order to qualify for a tax deduction in connection with a 2015 filing.

Those officers were assassinated on December 20. This bill extends the date of eligibility. Upon enactment, charitable contributions made by this year's April 15 tax deadline would be deductible immediately.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has scored the bill as having a negligible budgetary impact of \$500,000 or less over 10 years. It is similar, as Chairman RYAN pointed out, to legisla-

tion this Congress passed in 2014 and in 2010 in the wake of natural disasters in the Philippines and Haiti.

The assassinations of Detective Ramos and Detective Liu were a national tragedy that shocked the conscience of America and shook New York City to its core. In the aftermath, we cannot forget the families left behind when these two brave heroes were killed tragically in the line of duty. As part of that effort, this legislation will take a significant step in that direction.

Let me again thank Chairman RYAN and Representative KING, as well as the other cosponsors of the bill, for their support in bringing this legislation to the floor.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 1527, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York said it very, very well. I think this is the right and appropriate thing to do, and I thank him for bringing it to our attention.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015. This bill, championed by Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES, which I was proud to co-sponsor, will encourage charitable contributions to the families of slain New York Police Department (NYPD) Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos by extending the tax deduction period for such contributions. I have been fortunate to meet and talk with the families of these two heroes.

The government has a moral duty to reward those who step forward in times of tragedy. The Slain Officer Family Support Act is critical to ensuring that those who kindly assist the families of slain NYPD Officers Liu and Ramos are rewarded. I commend Representative JEFFRIES for his hard work on this important bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, every day hundreds of thousands of federal, state, and local law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately, the grave risk that our law enforcement officers face was tragically confirmed again this past Christmas when on-duty NYPD officers Ramos and Liu were murdered while simply sitting in their squad car. Regrettably, attacks against our nation's law enforcement officials are too common. Just yesterday, we read the news about two more law enforcement officers, San Jose Police Officer Michael Johnson and a state trooper in Wisconsin, who were shot and killed responding to incidents. Every loss of life is tragic. Our communities are particularly heartbroken when the life of a law enforcement official is taken. But when the funerals are over and the news subsides, it is families and coworkers who must continue to cope with the tragic loss.

Thankfully, many Americans did what they could to ease the burden of the family members that Detectives Ramos and Liu left behind. That is why I am proud to support the Slain Officer Family Support Act. This bill would provide those who have opened their hearts to the families of these slain officers

with a corresponding charitable deduction on their 2014 tax returns. We must continue to honor and remember the sacrifice of these officers and support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1527.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE UNITED STATES POST OFFICE RENAMING

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of New Jersey's sons, Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine of Waldwick, New Jersey.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine was killed almost 3 years ago this week, on March 27, 2012, while conducting combat operations in Afghanistan. In the greatest act of sacrifice possible, he gave his life while protecting his fellow men and women in uniform. He was just 29 years old.

Today, I come to the floor of the House to introduce legislation that will ensure that Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's legacy lives on for generations to come.

This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building.

Understandably, no action by this Congress could ever repay Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's sacrifice. This bill, however, will create a permanent and visible memory of his heroism.

Although this bill passed this House last Congress, unfortunately, my colleagues in the Senate did not take it up. So I come here tonight, hopeful that my colleagues in both the House and Senate will take action to get this bill passed and signed into law so that his legacy will live on.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, sex trafficking is one of the world's most monstrous, pervasive, and underpenalized crimes. Up to 300,000 American children are at risk of being trafficked annually.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which I coauthored with Congressman POE and which passed this House unanimously in January,

clarifies that the true criminals are the traffickers who enslave adolescents and the Johns who prey upon them.

The bill would create stiffer penalties and enforcement for the demand side of human trafficking and provide restitution to the survivors.

The bill has strong support in the other body, but it is being complicated by a proposed expansion of the Hyde amendment, which I do not support.

We must pass this bill. The Senate should either take up the House-passed version or find some other compromise. The voiceless victims of modern-day slavery in its most horrific form of cruelty cannot afford to wait any longer.

REMEMBERING DAVID MARSH

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

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to stand with others in my district—my constituents—and offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of David Marsh, who passed away early Monday.

David became the victim of a senseless act of violence as he stood behind the counter of Lee Mart, the convenience store where he worked for 25 years in Murray, Utah. He was shot during a robbery.

Many individuals are honored on this floor after receiving accolades and publicity, but I wish to honor David because of his consistent positive impact on others. He made a profound impression on those he met through his hard work and dedication. He was a wonderful father and role model who became a fixture in the community. His kind and loving nature made his family, friends, and acquaintances smile.

It is people like David who make our Nation great. I hope that we can all honor the life of David Marsh by being engaged citizens and connecting with love and understanding to the people around us.

GERMANWINGS FLIGHT 9525

(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, I rise this evening with deep sadness in the wake of the terrible tragedy involving Germanwings Flight 9525.

While the investigation is still ongoing, it is believed that all 150 passengers on board have been lost, including three American citizens. Also on board were 16 German students who were on their way back to Germany following their 10th-grade class trip to Spain.

Mr. Speaker, every tragedy of this magnitude brings heartbreak, but we are especially saddened by the loss of so many young people full of hope and promise.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that investigators can quickly determine the cause of this tragedy for the victims' families.

As cochair of the bipartisan German-American Congressional Caucus, I want to offer my heartfelt thoughts and prayers to all the victims and their families, and our allies in the several countries currently addressing this tragedy.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: THE BUDGET'S IMPACT ON WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, my colleagues and I debated and passed a budget about which I have quite a few concerns.

Budgets are statements of values. They should map out the priorities we have for our Nation. The resolution that the House adopted earlier suggests that our priorities are the interests of the top 1 percent of earners, the interests of corporations. Certainly, not the interests of working families.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, according to a Pew Center analysis of census data, 4 out of every 10 households with children now have a mother who is either the sole or primary bread winner. That means that 40 percent of families are led by woman.

As we approach the end of Women's History Month, my Congressional Progressive Caucus colleague and I have come to the floor this evening to talk about the impacts of the Republican budget on women.

As I have said, women now lead 40 percent of our Nation's households with children, a huge socioeconomic shift for this country; but when you dig deeper, 25 percent of those households are single-parent homes where women are the only provider. Those women need health care to be able to keep going to work. As we know, Mr. Speaker, not every employer offers health care.

Fortunately, 5 years ago, we passed the Affordable Care Act, and now, more than 16 million Americans have access to health insurance, many of them for the first time.

The Affordable Care Act gave women more control over their health than

they have ever had before, with free preventative care, including annual screenings, and free coverage for contraceptives. There were also a host of benefits, economic and otherwise.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that combined Federal spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly referred to as CHIP, will be \$682 billion less over the 2011–2020 period than projected in 2010 without the Affordable Care Act.

Our national healthcare costs have, indeed, slowed dramatically. The uninsured rate for working-age adults dropped 35 percent, from 20.3 to 13.2 percent; but it seems that all the bill's benefits don't mean much to my Republican colleagues who have found a huge and factually questionable portion of their budget's "savings" from repealing the law.

Mr. Speaker, we have just discussed the impact of health care and the Republicans' budget repeal of the ACA. Without access to the health care they need for themselves and their families, Republicans must be assuming that women will be able to take paid time off for work. Unfortunately, we passed the wrong budget for that.

To tell you a little more about this problem, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to support the people's budget.

The Federal budget is not just a financial document; it is a moral document. The best way to grow our economy is to ensure that Americans have good jobs that pay a livable wage.

The numbers that you just heard is a fact. In 40 percent of households with children under 18, mothers are either the only or the primary source of income for the family. Many of these mothers do not have the support of affordable childcare, paid family leave, or paid sick days.

Increasing the minimum wage and providing paid medical or sick leave will have a direct positive impact on millions of working mothers. As of last month, 3 States and 17 cities will soon have or now have paid sick leave day laws. This is a good start, but, as Members of Congress, we need to set a national standard, and we need to do it now.

Our Nation's failure to establish a basic workplace standard of paid sick days is hurting workers, is hurting families and the public health. Nearly 4 in 10 private sector workers and 80 percent of the low wage workers do not have a single paid sick day. Is that what we want our budget to reflect?

The Republicans say they are for families; yet their budget represents more of the same. The budget that the Republicans have introduced doesn't invest in growing our infrastructure. It cuts vital programs like Medicaid and helps keep working families in poverty. This is totally unacceptable. Paid sick

days keep families financially secure, workplaces and communities healthy and productive.

The Institute for Women's Policy Research calculates that the Federal Government could prevent over 2,600 lost jobs for women. Why? Because 2,600 women left their jobs because they were not offered paid parental leave.

The people's budget will create over 8 million good-paying new jobs by 2018. The people's budget also ensures that our tax codes work for everyone by closing tax loopholes and expanding the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I support the people's budget because deficit reduction should not be fixed on the backs of hard-working Americans. We must put people first. Do you pay your car note before you buy groceries for your family? No.

I agree that we must pay down the deficit; but at what cost?

There are many things we must cover in our Federal budget, but, Mr. Speaker, people must be first.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, with more women as the primary breadwinners than ever, it is important to point out that two-thirds of the minimum wage workers are women.

Women are notoriously underrepresented with equal pay for equal work. The Federal minimum wage right now is only \$7.25 per hour. A woman working full time would make just \$14,500. That is below the poverty line for a family of three.

If we want to make sure American families can work hard to get ahead, it seems that we would want to make sure they are getting paid enough to do so; yet this issue is completely absent from the Republican budget, and still, women will be notoriously underpaid for the work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, women are also notoriously underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. These are the jobs of tomorrow. These are the jobs that will grow our economy, that will make us globally competitive.

Unfortunately, we cannot address these issues of underrepresentation of women in those areas—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—because the Republican budget that we passed today does not think it is important.

The people's budget, on the other hand, would lift the minimum wage, would increase the opportunities for women in educational fields where they have been underrepresented and would result in a raise for more than 27.8 million workers, including the 15.3 million women.

There are broader societal impacts to raising the minimum wage as well. For starters, since women are the majority of minimum wage workers, lifting that Federal minimum wage would close the pay gap by nearly 5 percent. I know it has been said time and again, Mr.

Speaker, but raising the minimum wage will also boost our economy.

For these workers, additional wages aren't dropping into savings accounts; they are paying for things they need right now. Research indicates that for every \$1 added to minimum wage, low wage worker households spent an additional \$2,800 the following year. That is a win-win situation.

Unfortunately, we didn't adopt the budget that included the minimum wage increase. We adopted the budget that included new tax cuts for the top 1 percent at the expense of the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, the point that we have tried to make here is that we have passed the wrong budget. The Republican budget is wrong for women. It is wrong for the middle class. It is wrong for the Nation's economy.

The foundations of the American Dream are crumbling beneath our feet just right as we speak, with stagnant wages, struggling schools, and a wealth gap that is only getting bigger.

We can't move forward with policies that are only going to make matters worse. We need to open our eyes and fight together for policies that will build an economy that works for everyone.

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

THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of the greatest moral crises of our time: student loan debt on my generation. Because of student loan debt, an entire generation is in financial quicksand.

Here are some startling facts of the student loan debt that our generation carries today. Approximately 40 million Americans had one or more student loans. The average amount owed on student loans is \$33,000, and 70 percent of students graduating this year will be burdened with this debt.

On average, it will take a student with this debt, graduating with a bachelor's degree, over 19 years to pay off their loans.

This evening, the House Democratic Caucus' Future Forum will address this moral crisis, and we have got a number of Members who will work with us this evening to talk about their personal stories or stories that they are hearing in their district.

We have also asked Americans across our country, including in my congressional district in the East Bay, to tweet or Facebook at us under #mystudentdebt or #futureforum; and we will answer some of their tweets this evening.

First, I am going to yield to a colleague of mine who came in, in the

113th Congress, somebody who had student loan debt himself and represents a district in Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a small town in Washington State that I now have the opportunity and the honor of representing.

My folks were schoolteachers. My father, actually, this year, is in his 50th year as a teacher in the classroom. The reality is I couldn't have gone to college if it hadn't been for the support of my community and the assistance of financial aid.

I got grants and I got loans that made the dream of college a reality, and I had a community that had my back, that literally passed the hat by providing me with scholarships to help me fulfill my own dreams of a college education.

I believe that education is the door to opportunity, and for a lot of families, including mine, financial aid is the key to that door; but the reality is, for too many families today, that door is locked. We have got work to do.

In 2013, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass legislation to protect student borrowers so that they can obtain low interest rates, but our work isn't done. We need to continue to have a commitment to quality and affordable education.

That is why I am proud to be a co-sponsor of a bill that would allow those with outstanding student loan debt to be able to refinance at the same low rate as new borrowers.

□ 1930

Two and a half centuries ago, Benjamin Franklin wrote: "An investment in knowledge pays the greatest interest." I think that was true when he wrote it, and I think it remains true today. We know this.

Not every student is going to go to college, but we know that college is a door-opener. We know that. And we know that America's competitiveness depends on our ability to have a good, skilled, qualified workforce, to have quality educational opportunities for our workforce. We know that as educational attainment rises, so do wages and so do employment levels.

We know that it is wiser to invest in education on the front end than it is to pay for prisons and unemployment on the back end; and that, to a large degree, is a decision that we make as a country and as a society. But that only works if we provide opportunities for students, if we ensure that they don't drown in debt.

In our Nation, student loan debt now surpasses credit card debt. We need to make sure that when young people graduate college, they have an opportunity to join the workforce, to start a business, or to teach the next generation, not simply to be bogged down with debt.

One of the coolest parts of this job is the opportunity to get to meet with young people, to get to meet with college students and high school students,

people who have a long way ahead of them. And I think about what I want for those students. I think about what I want for my own kids. I want them to be able to look at the future not with fear of debt and fear of astronomical financial obligations but with hope for their future.

I know that the college education that I was afforded and the financial aid that I received that paid for that college opportunity enabled me to live a lifetime that was filled with hope. So we have got work to do. And I, for one, am committed to working with the good gentleman from California and others in this Congress—hopefully from both sides of the aisle—to address this opportunity and make sure that all young people and, frankly, all who want to pursue educational opportunity see that door open to them.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I know there are a number of colleges in your district in Washington or around your district. And when you talk to young people today and they are thinking about going to college, how much are you hearing that the potential of debt is weighing on that decision?

Mr. KILMER. I appreciate the question. It is the main concern that we hear.

I was in a high school classroom just last month and heard concerns from students who said: I want to go to college. I want to pursue that opportunity, but I am fearful that I won't be able to afford it.

We have seen in my State and in States all throughout this country that as States faced difficult budget times, two things happened. One, State support for our educational institutions got cut, and tuition rose. Oftentimes, financial aid—either from the institutions or from other sources—didn't keep up with those increases in tuition. So young people are concerned about that. They recognize that further education is going to be really important for their chances of getting a good job. Again, not every job requires higher education, but as we look at those fastest-growing jobs in our economy, more and more of those jobs require at least some postsecondary education.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. And is it just young people who are concerned about it? What do you hear from their parents as far as what the debt means if they have got a child who has just graduated college and is out there in the job market? Are you hearing from the parents as well?

Mr. KILMER. It is certainly a huge concern.

In nearly every town hall meeting I have, concerns around student loan debt and access to affordable, quality education come up. But even outside of parents, there are folks in my community who have, unfortunately, lost their jobs and want to go back to school.

I was at Olympic College in my district in Bremerton, Washington, and their foundation had a luncheon that

was to support students and their ability to pay for college. We heard from one of the students who was a more mature student who had started her college career either sleeping in her car or sleeping in the student center. And that, for too many people, is a reality these days. We need to make sure that education is affordable, that education is quality, and that the key that financial aid represents to that door of opportunity is available for everybody.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Washington, and I look forward to seeing your good work across Washington and in this Congress to address this moral crisis of our generation.

Mr. KILMER. Thank you.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I mentioned that we are going to be having a conversation not just here on the House floor, but we have been talking to young Americans and people with student debt across America. So you can tweet on your phone at #mystudentdebt or on Facebook at #mystudentdebt or also tweet under #futureforum.

I just want to read one of the first tweets that came in on this, and this came from Natalie Collier. She is from my hometown in Dublin, California. It is a place where, when I was growing up there, only less than 30 percent of the high school graduates were going on to 4-year universities. That number has more than doubled today. But young people like Natalie who have gone on to college have this to say.

She is in college now and she said that she pays \$300 each month to reduce her interest payments, and without such payments, she could save to buy a house.

So we are asking on social media, first: What is your monthly payment for your student loan debt? For some student loans, you have to start paying them immediately while you are still in college, especially for many of the private ones. Others you have to pay them immediately upon graduation.

The second question is: What would you do with that money if you weren't spending it on your student loan debt? How would you spend that money?

With Natalie's \$300, we can imagine if she didn't have to spend that on her student loan debt, that would be spent in the economy, hopefully allowing her to save to buy a home, pay her auto payment, pay her rent, hopefully near where she works, and she doesn't have to spend as much time on the road.

So there is a ripple effect that goes out into the economy if we can lessen the burden that the student loan debt has on younger people in our country.

This issue is one that is personal to me because I have student loan debt. My student loan story is that I was fortunate to go to college on an athletic scholarship. That was the only reason I was able to go to college.

My parents were not able to afford to send me to college, and I knew that I had to work hard and play soccer well,

and that would be my ticket and that I would be the first in my family to go to college. But like many young athletes, I got injured. I wanted to stay in college, so I had to take out student loans. About 90 percent of the student loans I took out were Federal student loans, but there had to be a bridge between the Federal student loans I had and the tuition that I owed. So we had to take out some higher interest private loans.

Over \$100,000 is what I have today, and I never complained about it. I knew it was an investment in my future. And I worked every job I could to try to make it work and to meet the tuition demands that I had every semester.

But I have talked to young people from where I grew up and across our country, and I have realized that this isn't something that is just affecting me. I pay roughly \$400 a month still on my student loan debt. It is something that is weighing like an anchor on young people across our country—41 million young people, approximately, with over \$1 trillion in student debt.

It weighs on every major decision they have to make in their formative years: when or whether to start a family, being able to buy their first home, leaving the job they have to take a risk and go out and start a business on their own.

Of all of these decisions, the biggest factor for young people today is that student debt that they carry. And it is weighing them down. It is weighing an entire generation down, and it is something that this United States Congress must do.

I am glad to see here for his second Future Forum appearance my colleague from Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS.

And I would be interested, Congressman POLIS, in what you think and what you are hearing from young people as far as how this weighs on decisions they have to make and what we can do here in the Congress.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue and for raising public awareness about the role that Congress should play and is failing to play with regard to making college more affordable.

This morning I had the opportunity to meet with the chancellor of one of our flagship State universities in the district I represent, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Chancellor Phil DiStefano came by, and we talked a lot about college affordability.

Now, the university, in its own right, I am proud to say, is doing what they can. They are creating a new 3-year program, where students can graduate in 3 years and only have to pay for 3 years of tuition. They are also creating an interest-free installment program, where students can pay their fees spread out over a longer period of time without interest, financed through the university.

And I am very proud to report that CU will only increase student tuition by 3 percent this year, which is the lowest increase in several decades.

Now, moving from what many of our universities are trying to do in their own right to what Congress can do is where we need to shift the discussion here. Making student loans more affordable, reducing the interest rate, and in some cases, raising the cap available are all absolutely, absolutely critical to help young people afford a higher education that enables them to succeed in the workforce.

We are not doing enough. We ought to address some of the cost drivers within higher education. I think we took a good first step with the Affordable Care Act, with looking at some of the costs of health care in education.

Another example is looking at some of the costs of content acquisition. Dr. Phil DiStefano was telling me that their library costs of acquiring material and keeping their professional journal subscriptions is increasing at 15 percent a year. One of their cost drivers. That is why some of us here supported a bill—and President Obama took the first steps on this—to make sure that taxpayer-supported research, money that is funded through NIH or NASA, taxpayer-funded research—is made freely available to the public and is not only available in prescription journals that not only raise the costs for our universities but make access to the very science that we, the people, financed less egalitarian by limiting it to those who can pay for it.

In addition, we talked about open source textbooks. Would you believe that after you pay tuition, after you finally, you know—oh, my gosh, with this debt and my parents' help and my job—oh, but then guess what? \$1,100 for textbooks. I kid you not.

I had heard from a lot of students that their textbooks were \$1,100, \$1,200. And I asked the chancellor today. I said, Am I hearing from the students in the worst-case scenario? He said, No, that is average. That is average. It is costing the average student \$1,100 a semester for the textbooks they need to succeed. We don't need that. We can, through innovation, disintermediate that and have collaborative open source content of the same or superior quality that professors put together for students and is available for free or near free.

It doesn't matter if people want it online or as a textbook. The physical act of producing a textbook is only \$3 or \$4, not \$50 or \$100. Most of that profit margin goes to textbook companies. Very little is with the authors or the professors who contributed the work. They largely do it for professional consideration and prestige. And if we can build a culture that supports and empowers content platforms that are open source, we can truly bring down those textbook costs which are so onerous for students in higher education.

So we should challenge Congress to do something about the looming student debt crisis, not just for the students that are accruing it today, but for people who graduated 5 or 10 years ago and are still suffering under the yoke of the debt that they incurred that allowed them to have a decent job in America.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I mean, this seems like a problem of, What do you do with the student today and the student tomorrow? And that revolves around what the interest rates are going to be.

And you just alluded to, this isn't just about today and tomorrow. This is about the generation that took on the debt and is carrying it now and is in the workforce.

We have just introduced in the Congress the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, introduced by our colleague from Connecticut, JOE COURTNEY, which kind of goes to this. And maybe you could talk a little bit about what can we do for students who already have this debt and they hear most of the focus being on the interest rate for the future. What can we try to help them as they try to navigate with this debt?

Mr. POLIS. We can't forget students who financed their education at higher interest rates, when inflation was higher, who years after their graduation still suffer under the yoke of debt. That is the reason why Representative COURTNEY brought forth his bill.

And when I hear from constituents, that is one of the top things that I hear. I hear from people who might have graduated 3 years ago, 5 years ago, even 20 years ago, but their debt load is impacting their ability to live their lives; their ability to buy a home, which they can't do because of it; their ability to have a family simply because of the way or the manner that they financed it or the time they financed it.

So I think it is absolutely appropriate for us to find a way to make sure that people are rewarded for their educational achievement and not penalized.

□ 1945

The greatest asset our country has is our intellectual capital. It is the ideas and knowledge of our people. That is our greatest asset. Yet in this day and age the fact that we are penalizing people for bettering themselves and for acquiring knowledge that is needed for our economy to succeed is absolutely ridiculous, and that is exactly what we need to do.

I invite the gentleman from California to talk about how some of these issues were highlighted in the recent budget debates we had because when a lot of people hear, oh, the Democrats and Republicans are fighting about the budget, it seems very esoteric. They say: What is this budget? What is that budget? Well, these are very important statements because it shows how each party would govern. Specifically, the

visions that each budget set forth with regard to higher education, college and how to afford it are night and day.

I am hoping that you can talk about, just moments before on the floor of this very House, the budget that, unfortunately, our Republican colleagues passed and then contrast that with the budget that you and I voted for which would have made college more affordable and helped families afford college.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Just looking at the Twitter feed, we see @hi_moya saying: As graduation approaches, my student debt looms over me like an oncoming storm. It makes me hesitant to start grad school.

I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado alluding to the budget that we, just moments ago on this House floor, voted on. We had two competing budgets when it came to many issues that are important to this country. But for my generation, looking at the generation of 18- to 35-year-olds, there is no issue that is more important and affects more people than student loan debt.

The Republican budget would cut \$220 billion in funds for college accessibility. It would cut Pell grants. It would cut subsidized student loan programs, and it cuts income-based repayment. These backward policies not only are hurting students, they are hurting the progress of our economy. They would make college more unaffordable for millions of prospective students.

Nine million students today benefit from Pell grants. Two-thirds of African American students receive Pell grants, and half of Latino students receive Pell grants. Nine out of 10 Pell grant recipients are already taking out student loans. These students need more help from their government.

I want to make it clear that no student that I have ever talked to, no student who has ever taken on the debt believes that this should just be a handout or a gift from the government. The position of the Future Forum, the position of the House Democratic Caucus is that if you believe in young people, if you take a chance on them, and if they are hard-working and qualified, they will take that investment, they will take that risk, and they will pay back their student loan debt. But we don't have to gouge them. The government doesn't have to make money on young people looking for a way up. The government doesn't have to make money on people who are looking for and seeking to seize upon opportunity.

Speaking of young people, just joining us now here in the House Chamber is a first-term Member of Congress, someone who is also making a second Future Forum appearance and someone who cares deeply about what student loan debt means for the constituents in his Pennsylvania district.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to BRENDAN BOYLE.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I very much appreciate the lead-

ership that the gentleman from California has shown in forming our caucus, and also especially when it comes to this issue which is near and dear to my heart. I have talked many times during my campaign about the fact that I thought it would change the dynamic to now have a Member of Congress who himself has tens of thousands of dollars of student loan debt because I wanted to do exactly what we are doing tonight, be able to speak on the House floor and say, yes, this is an incredibly serious issue that needs to be dealt with as the national problem that it is.

Depending on how you judge mortgages, student loans are considered either the largest source of debt or the second largest source of debt in America today, a tenfold increase in the last 20 years—tenfold increase. That is unsustainable. I believe that it is unfair and a tremendous burden to those who are young and, frankly, not so young and raising families of their own. But not only is there the fairness argument, there is also the argument that it just makes no sense for the United States of America in the 21st century to be going in this direction, to be penalizing those who are attempting to better themselves and become better workers, become better trained and ensure that they can participate in the workforce of the 21st century.

So I believe that this is an issue, frankly, that has been undercovered and underfocused on over the last several years. I believe that there is a danger of this actually being a student loan debt bubble. And I believe that it is about time that this Congress, the House and the Senate, finally dealt with this as the national crisis that it is.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. So I would ask the gentleman, I am looking through our Twitter feed here, and we have got a number of people who have kind of chimed in on it. One young person just tweeted at us, Dolores Tejada. She is a child of immigrants from Guatemala, and she is the first in her family to go to college. Her parents, she said, make the minimum wage, and she has been working for 6 years at a non-profit and pays \$350 a month on her student loan debt. She said without this payment, she would buy a car—she currently has to share one with the entire family—and she would move out of her parents' house.

Have you heard stories like Dolores' in your district or across our country?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Well, first, I couldn't help identify with the tweet from Dolores. Like she, I am a first-generation American. My father is an immigrant. And like Dolores, I am the first in my family to go to college. Student loans played an important part in enabling me to go to college. So I don't in any way use my own personal experience as a woe is me. I consider myself one of the very fortunate ones.

But the fact that I had the benefit of winning scholarships and piecing together student loans and tens of thousands of them along with every work-study job you can imagine, the fact that I am actually one of the lucky ones and it was that difficult, I know so many people in the neighborhood where I grew up in Philadelphia who weren't as fortunate. I know so many people today in my neighborhood and all throughout the country who have exactly the same story that Dolores had in that she says: Well, with this extra \$350 a month, I would be buying a car; I would be saving for a down payment on a home.

It is interesting. I hear these kinds of stories not just from those who are in repayment, I hear them from Realtors who have been in the business two, three, or four decades. They will say to me: BRENDAN, I can't tell you what a difference it is today. Back when I was starting out, I would sell so many homes to younger people, 24, 25, 26. Now I don't have one customer in their twenties. Why? Because the student loan payments are taking that up.

So that means that it doesn't only hurt the graduate who is in repayment; it also has a spillover effect in our overall economy. It hurts the Realtors. It hurts the contractors who would have done work once that young couple or the young person bought a house. It hurts the Home Depot down the street. There is this spillover effect in our economy. And it is getting to the larger point I was talking about that this is not just a problem for young people. This is a problem for families who want to send their kids to college. This is a problem for Realtors. This is a problem for anyone who wants economic development to be spurred in our country. Essentially, this is a national issue.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are looking at Twitter, and I see Jenna on Twitter from New York City, who says: I chose a State school as the affordable choice over better schools where I was accepted and still have \$30,000 in student loan debt.

Are you seeing that in Pennsylvania where the State universities are starting to see their tuitions go up almost as much as the tuition at private universities?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Well, unfortunately, yes. While I am a born and raised and proud Pennsylvanian, I am sad to say on this score we are the second worst in the country. We have the second most expensive public colleges and universities in the Nation. Sure enough, our Pennsylvania residents have the second highest amount of student loan debt in the country. So this is a problem affecting my State. It affects all 50 States, but, unfortunately, it is worse in my home State than almost every other State in the country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Now, we are talking about student loan debt as well as student loan interest rates, two separate issues, but both affecting

essentially the same generation. We saw just this week our colleague, JOE COURTNEY, within the past week introduced his bill. I want to see if the gentleman has a position on this. It is the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. What it would do is it would allow eligible student loan borrowers to refinance their private and Federal loans. As the gentleman knows, if you have an auto loan or if you have a home loan and if you have a business loan, you can often, if qualified, refinance those loans as interest rates change and the markets change. Right now, you can't do that with student loans.

How do you think this would change the debt load that young people are carrying today if they could take that student loan to the marketplace and find competitive refinancing rates.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I am proud to be a cosponsor of Representative COURTNEY's bill. ELIZABETH WARREN is the sponsor in the Senate of the companion legislation.

This would have a transformative effect on helping those who right now are struggling with the student loan payment. So many of the ideas that we have are more geared toward those who will be going to college and aren't yet college age. This is the one idea that can actually help those who are living today under the burden of higher student loan debt.

It is important to note that neither of us are talking about forgiving debt or eliminating debt or giving people a free ride or allowing them to get away from the debts they incur. We are simply saying allow them to have the market mechanism that so many others have; allow them to refinance at the current low rates. This would be a tremendous savings, literally tens of billions of dollars saved. And then that is money that in turn will be repumped into our economy. So I believe it would have an incredibly positive effect, and I am a strong supporter of it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I am glad you mentioned the effect it would have on the economy. I just heard 2 minutes ago from Andreas Giraldo. He said with the \$389 that is going to student loan debt, I could be buying a house. If you just imagine, you take 40 million people who have debt right now, and if we found a way for them to refinance it or reduce it and save them hundreds a month, they are not going to just sit on that money or put it under the mattress. They are going to put that money back into the economy.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I am thinking of you being in California in a much more expensive area than, while Pennsylvania is not cheap, by California standards, it is much more affordable. How much of an effect would it have for the young, bright, well-educated folks in northern California if they could suddenly have an extra, 3, 400 a month to help them afford the cost of living there and save for a down payment?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. The bay area is a beautiful place to live. It is 80 degrees there this week. It is one of the most educated places in the world. It has an innovation economy that is charting the course for the new American economy and is really defining how the American worker is going to work going forward. But the biggest downfall, the downside, if there is any in the bay area right now, is the cost of living. It costs so much to own a house. It costs so much for health care and starting a business. There are so many costs to be in the bay area today that it is pricing out young people.

So if you go to a good school, you are qualified, you make it to a good school, you take on the student loan debt, and you want to go into the workforce, with the debt that you carry, first, chances are you are not going to be able to live anywhere near where you are going to work because you are not going to be able to afford it.

I had the California Association of Realtors in my office today. Our local rep, Otto Catrina, was telling me how hard it is for him. He told me the story today of somebody who works at one of the largest tech companies in America. This person makes, he said, over \$100,000 a year. And because of the student loan debt that she has, she is having a very, very difficult time buying a house. That is somebody who makes over \$100,000 a year, and that is in the upper echelon of incomes in our country.

Can you imagine the middle class worker, the hard-working American who is making \$40,000, \$50,000 a year, wants to maybe go do some good and teach in a classroom? How is that person going to live near where they work? How is that person going to buy a home? How is that person going to start a family and have kids?

So I am glad the gentleman asked that, because those are the stories I see back where I grew up. That is why people care about that issue.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. You actually just referenced another point of this that I think is such a good point, and that is that this student loan debt is actually preventing young people from going out and starting their own businesses, which is a personal tragedy for them, but also has, again, tremendously negative effects on our overall economy. I am wondering, particularly in an entrepreneurial area like the bay area, you must hear similar stories.

□ 2000

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We have become in the Bay Area a place where approximately 75 percent of the venture funding is going right now. There are a lot of smart, young, energetic determined people with good ideas, but they don't have a lot of funding. And for them the decision becomes, well, I have got this job right now that pays my student loan debt and pays my other bills, but I have this

great idea, which is my passion, which is my dream. But if I leave my job and I risk it all, I still have this debt; it is going to follow me, and it is going to be really hard if this doesn't take off. I see that decision point so often across the Bay Area.

I just think, as you said, we are not asking to just completely say to every bank, You no longer can collect on this debt. I think what we are asking is, Let's start the conversation. How do we reduce it? How do we refinance it? How do we give people more money in their pocket every month so that they can help themselves lift up their families and help our economy?

I see in the Chamber here with us our former caucus chair JOHN LARSON, the gentleman from Connecticut. I am putting him on the spot a little bit here. But I know he cares just as much as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I do about what young people in his district are doing and how student loan debt affects him. So I am just wondering if our former chair could weigh in on what we can do in the Congress to help young people with student loan debt.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Well, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their hard work in this subject matter area.

Certainly we know that all credit debt combined is exceeded by the amount of debt that those who attend and receive a college education are currently bearing and the awful burden that that has created on the working members of the middle class and how difficult a burden it is, so I commend the gentlemen for their efforts here on the floor.

First of all, it starts with our budget that we debated today in making sure that there are not cuts to Pell grants, but there are investments made in Pell grants.

Frankly, as people talk about repatriation, that is, as both the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and California know, where money has been sent overseas, and there is a lot of talk about bringing money back and what will we do with that, what about a trust fund that will allow an opportunity for young people all across America to refinance and restructure their ability to pay off their college debt? It is not a novel idea.

After all, isn't that what we did for Wall Street after 2008? Isn't that what we did to make sure that banks and financial institutions didn't fail? Shouldn't we do this for the human infrastructure, for all those hard-working families who have refinanced their home, who have gone into their personal savings, who are saddled with enormous amounts of debt?

What a great thing for the country and how valuable that would be for people to once again be able to have completed a college education, place themselves in a position to be more productive members of society, but

also in a position where they are not burdened with the debt that prevents them from carrying on a life, to get married, to purchase a first home, to buy a new automobile, all the things that help our economy grow, all the reasons that they went to college in the first place.

So I commend the two gentlemen for their continuous work in this area, your support of the Democratic budget. What a great job that CHRIS VAN HOLLEN did today articulating the values that this side of the aisle has been putting forward not only in terms of the morality of the issue, but also the economic impact that it has on so many working families.

I hope that our distinguished colleagues from California and Pennsylvania will join us in the second hour in a discussion on all generations on Social Security.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I was just going to say how happy I am to welcome Mr. LARSON as the newest member to the Future Caucus. There aren't many of us that have such wonderful white hair in the future caucus.

But what is interesting is this is an exact linkage to the subject that we are going to talk about next with respect to Social Security. And that is, it is all part of the same system. The idea that you give opportunity to people, you demand responsibility, they pay into a system, they benefit at some point, and then the next generation benefits.

People on Social Security today are able to benefit because of the workers of today. Thirty, 40 years from now, those students who are worrying about student loans will probably still be in the workforce and making, hopefully, more money that will pay into Social Security that will help the workers of today, who will be the retirees of tomorrow. So this is all actually linked and part of making America work.

So I am proud to be with the two gentlemen.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you. I don't think we could end on a more inspirational note than the eloquent words from our former chairman from Connecticut, Mr. LARSON.

This is about the future. I am proud to be a sponsor of the Social Security Fairness Act. I am glad that is getting some attention this evening.

To summarize, the Future Forum and what we aspire for young people to have is not a handout when it comes to student loan debt, not a complete free pass where you just take on government investments and you don't give anything back.

What we are saying is that if you are qualified and you worked hard and you have the student loan debt, it should be easier than it is today. We should be able to pass JOE COURTNEY's bill and allow you to refinance. We should find every way possible to reduce this debt for each person as low as we can.

And if you are a student today, the government should not make money on

your student interest loan. They shouldn't make money. If you are qualified and able to go to college, especially if you are like the gentleman from Pennsylvania or myself and you are the first person in your family to go to college, we should reduce every barrier to college because it is a part of achieving that American Dream of starting a family, owning a home, buying a new automobile, and saving for a secure golden retirement.

So I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his help this evening and coming down as a special cameo guest appearance. And I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for, again, being a part of our Future Forum.

You can tweet us at #futureforum and we will continue this conversation until we address what is the greatest moral crisis of our generation—student loan debt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SOCIAL SECURITY 2100 ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here this evening to talk about and to follow two distinguished colleagues from California and Pennsylvania who spoke with great eloquence about the future, who were addressing the issue of student loans and student loan debt that we are experiencing all across the country.

This evening, I am here to discuss Social Security. Currently, before the Ways and Means Committee, we are addressing the issue of Social Security that, as everybody knows, not only covers old age and survivorship, but also disability.

That fund is due to expire in 2016 if Congress does not take action, due to be cut severely and have an impact on so many Americans. And yet all across this country, frankly, on a bipartisan basis on the committee and from without the committee, people are talking about coming up with solutions for Social Security.

That is why we have introduced the Social Security 2100 Act. Why 2100? Well, because we want to make sure that the program of Social Security, which by law is required to make sure that it is solvent for 75 years, in fact, is, and that is what our proposal does.

But I want to talk about this in terms of a pragmatic, practical, commonsense path forward to make sure that Social Security is not only there for seniors who are currently receiving it, but for future generations, as well.

Social Security is uniquely the most indispensable plan that the government has been committed to.

We have a slide that I would like to put up that demonstrates exactly how indispensable Social Security is.

Today, two-thirds of seniors rely on Social Security for the majority of

their income. Think about that for a moment. Of all the people that you know, of all the retirees that you are associated with, two-thirds of them rely on Social Security for a majority of their income.

The median retirement account balance for all Americans—all Americans—is \$2,500. Ask yourself, America: Is there anyone that could sustain themselves or a family or a spouse with \$2,500 in their retirement accounts and savings?

Only 14 percent of private sector workers are participating in defined benefit pensions. Well, what does that mean? That means that 86 percent of Americans are not. So what we are faced with in the United States Congress really isn't a Social Security problem, because we all know that Social Security works. Social Security has never missed a payment, and Social Security is there to both help people who are disabled, to help the spouse and the children who are survivors after an untimely death, and it is there in retirement and serves as a pension, as I said before, almost exclusively, for two-thirds of all of America.

So simply stated, it makes no sense at all to cut Social Security. It makes no sense at all to raise the age of Social Security.

Since 2008 and the Great Recession and the devastation that so many Americans went through, people who had worked hard and played by the rules and had invested their money in 401Ks, well, the reality is that they saw their 401K become a 101K. So it is long overdue for Congress to come together in a nonpartisan way to fully address this issue.

□ 2015

At the start of this session, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle developed a rule. I commend them for this rule. The rule says that you can't just address, simply, disability with respect to the Social Security trust fund.

You have to address both disability and old age and survivors' benefits collectively. That is the way the program has always been addressed, and I commend them for underscoring what is a retirement crisis and why we need to take these bold steps.

I say "retirement crisis" because you saw the statistic before where only 14 percent of the private sector workers are participating in defined benefit contributions. That simply cannot sustain us. What this particular chart shows is that more seniors than ever are also paying taxes on their Social Security benefits. So we have this retirement crisis in which two-thirds of Americans are retiring with just about Social Security as their only means of moving forward, their only means of sustaining themselves.

To further compound that problem, the way the Social Security Act was changed in 1983 has now found us in a situation in which taxable income over \$25,000 for a single person is subject to

being taxed and \$32,000 for a married couple. This is only escalating as more and more baby boomers retire into the system.

For example, in 1998—that was not that long ago—26 percent of all seniors came under this law and were taxed under the current law. Just last year, in 2014, that figure rose to 49 percent, and it is only growing.

We need to address this issue. Why? Because more seniors, out of necessity, are finding themselves working—working to make up for the loss that they incurred from 2008 forward in their 401(k)'s and in their investment portfolios, working to make ends meet.

One thing seniors understand and, I think, America understands is this: Social Security is not an entitlement. Certainly, you are entitled to Social Security payments; but why? You are entitled to them because they are the insurance that you paid for.

It is the earned compensation that people, through their hard work and sweat of their brow, have put into the system. The system is called FICA, the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Those contributions have been made by all Americans, and as I said earlier, they remain the bulk work for the Nation's retirement program and are the safety net that prevents seniors from retiring into poverty, that allows them to exist.

This is the time to focus on strengthening the Social Security Program. This is the time we should be talking about expanding the Social Security Program. It is because of the retirement crisis that we find ourselves here, not for lack of contribution, not for lack of effort, but because of the real economic conditions most families have found themselves in. That is why we introduced the Social Security 2100 Act.

What does it do? First and foremost, it doesn't raise the national debt at all. It is completely paid for. How do we know this? Because we have an actuarial report.

The chief actuary for Social Security has determined that it exceeds the 75-year limits in terms of its solvency so that Social Security will not only be here now, tomorrow, and well into the future, but Justin Bieber will be 106 years old, and Social Security will still be there for him and for those of his generation as well.

It is that important and vital a program for our Nation so that it needs our very specific and direct focus and attention.

With so many relying on Social Security, we also need to expand its benefits. We are proposing a modest 2 percent increase across the board, but we are also proposing what senior citizens know already, which is that the system that we have of calculating the COLA is inadequate and does not work.

Most importantly, it doesn't reflect what seniors actually pay, what they actually have to go through in terms of the costs of heating their homes, of

buying prescription drugs, and of paying for the escalating costs of food and heat and energy.

We have devised a system—endorsed widely by groups that embrace it—that we call the CPIE, the consumer price index based on the actual costs of the elderly, with the E standing for elderly in this circumstance. It makes sure that there are sufficient amounts of money that are there to provide for our senior citizens.

The next thing that we do is to make sure that nobody can retire into poverty. We raise the minimum benefit to 125 percent of poverty, which would amount to—in so many cases, at the lower end of the economic scale—a 50 percent increase in benefits for the poorest amongst us.

When I say “poor,” I mean the working poor, people who are pulled into the system. Again, this is not an entitlement. This is earned compensation. This is the insurance that so many have already paid for and why this has become so important and so vital a test.

We also provide a tax cut for 11 million working seniors. Let me repeat that. We provide a tax cut for 11 million seniors.

How do we do that? As we said earlier, people, out of necessity, have found themselves in this system. They have found themselves in a position in which, in retirement, they are finding themselves working. They work hard for their money, but as I said earlier, if they are single and if their combined incomes are more than \$25,000, they are taxed. If they are a couple and their combined incomes are \$32,000, they are taxed.

These numbers are easily reached and are being exceeded, and that is why we are recommending the tax cut by raising those limits and by providing those to working seniors, and there is a value that they bring to all of our communities with the break that they need so that they can sustain themselves and can also continue to pay their way in retirement with the benefits that they have earned, with the benefits that they have paid for but that haven't kept pace with the economic times.

It provides an across-the-board benefit increase of 2 percent for every senior, and it improves the cost-of-living adjustments by going to CPIE. As I said before, a new minimum benefit to ensure that no one who has paid into the system retires into poverty is flat out fair.

You may ask: How do you pay for this? Certainly, at the outset of this, we made the boast that this is solvent into the next century, beyond the 75 years that is required, signed off by the Social Security chief actuary, who has determined the solvency of the program.

How do we do this? First and foremost, we say that we ought to increase the contribution to the fund by 1 percent. Now, 1 percent may not seem like

a lot; but, when you have the whole country contributing, in fact, it is. Even at that 1 percent level, though, we believe that, especially in dealing with the times in which we are today, we ought to phase that in over a 25-year period.

What does that mean? What that means is that, for a worker who is making \$50,000 a year, for 50 cents a week, as part of his or her contribution, they get the most valuable governmental program in the history of this Nation, the program that keeps people out of poverty, the program that for more than two-thirds of them is the only retirement vehicle that they will have, the program that is also there in disability and for survivors' benefits.

We have so many Members in this body who can tell their stories about how they would not have made it without Social Security. Both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, PAUL RYAN, and probably one of the foremost authorities on the issue, RICHARD NEAL of Massachusetts, benefited from Social Security. It made it possible for their mothers to help them and their families into college and beyond, and look how successful both of them have been.

This is America's story. This is about America coming together, and that is why it is around modest, pragmatic, straightforward proposals that don't shy away from the cost but address it head on, that address it head on in a simple, pragmatic, commonsense manner.

These aren't taxes. These are contributions that people are making and that they are receiving a direct benefit from. It is unique amongst all of the programs that we have.

Along with the 1 percent increase phased in over 25 years, which amounts to .05 percent, or 50 cents a week for someone earning \$50,000 or more—less if you are earning less and a little bit more if you are earning more—we are also asking the top .4 percent to pay the same rate as everyone else.

As you may know, Social Security is taxed currently only up to \$118,000. After that, people stop paying into the system. What we are saying is: listen, the country is going through some difficult times.

People, especially those who work hard and play by the rules—the working class, the middle class, who are suffering under this—we ought to give them a little bit of a break.

Not until \$400,000 do we start taxing Social Security again—excuse me—asking those who are paying into the system to pay the same rate as everybody else at that level. Only .4 percent, we ask to pay to make this fund solvent, in conjunction with raising the percentage by 1 percent, for the next 75 years and beyond.

□ 2030

We keep Social Security strong for generations to come, and that is why

this is such a vital and important benefit for this great Nation of ours.

At the end of the day, what has made our country great, going back to those first settlers who all gathered together to help one another raise their homes and their barns and plow and sow and reap the benefits of their fields, Americans have rallied to come together, rallied with one another from the time the Thirteen Colonies formed the Union to today of our 50 States. Our States are unique, our States all have special qualities, but the one quality that we all share is that we are Americans.

Social Security is America's program. It is what Roosevelt recognized, as did the Congresses back then, the importance of dealing in our system of entrepreneurialism and capitalism and risk taking, that that gives us an unbelievable strength in a global and world economy, but it has to be balanced off with the value and the notion that if you work hard and play by the rules that your Nation is there for you as well, and that you can't retire into poverty after working all your life, that some calamity or misfortune, a disability, a tragic death can't ruin you or your family because it is part of a larger family, the United States of America.

God bless you. God bless America. Thank you for listening to this presentation.

We have 56 original cosponsors of this bill, and we know all across this country, the more that we talk about this straightforward, commonsense, practical solution to Social Security, Americans are going to require that Congress steps up to the plate and meets its responsibility and obligation to make sure that no senior, no individual can retire into poverty, and the system that has worked so extraordinarily well for every American is there not only today and tomorrow, but well into the future without raising the national debt and only calling upon Americans to do what they have done traditionally: contribute to a program that guarantees a secure retirement and pension and benefits that they will reap throughout a lifetime.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S.J. Res. 8. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 2015, at 9 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 173. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 27, 2015, through April 10, 2015 (Rept. 114-50). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1597. A bill to reform the acquisition system of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Science, Space, and Technology, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to amend the definition of the term "spouse" to recognize new State definitions of such term for the purpose of the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Com-

merce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DEFALZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1600. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to limit copayment, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a specialty drug tier to the dollar amount (or its equivalent) of such requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a non-preferred brand drug tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 1601. A bill to clarify membership requirements for the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the private treatment of veterans who are victims of military sexual assault; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to expand the eligibility of veterans to receive mental health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1605. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1606. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a national inter-section and interchange safety construction

program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BOST, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DOLD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. REED, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TROTT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr.

YOH0, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1610. A bill to establish biennial budgets for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. HARDY, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1612. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to extend Interstate Route 11; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 1613. A bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 1614. A bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1615. A bill to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1616. A bill to authorize the approval of natural gas pipelines and establish deadlines and expedite permits for certain natural gas gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1617. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsyl-

vania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1620. A bill to expedite the deployment of highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1621. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide a Federal charter to the Fab Foundation for the National Fab Lab Network, a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing community access to advanced manufacturing tools for learning skills, developing inventions, creating businesses, and producing personalized products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LONG, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1623. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the length of time for a certain permit; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of small employer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1625. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1626. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN):

H.R. 1627. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 1628. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in each Veterans Integrated Service Network a pain management board; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1630. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 1631. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1632. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to place certain lands in Skagit and San Juan Counties, Washington, into trust for the Samish Indian Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1633. A bill to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1634. A bill to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARR, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1636. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 1637. A bill to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1638. A bill to assure that the services of a nonemergency department physician are available to hospital patients 24 hours a day, seven days a week in all non-Federal hospitals with at least 100 licensed beds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the charter school programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1640. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution recognizing the disparate impact of climate change on women and the efforts of women globally to address climate change; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 171. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 172. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 174. A resolution expressing support for designation of March as "National Multiple Myeloma Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. LUCAS:
H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states the Congress shall have the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 1602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 12 and 13, which gives Congress the power “To raise and support Armies,” and “To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:
H.R. 1604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Export-Import Bank is purported to be authorized under the congressional power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations” in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—

The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations re-

specting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses:

1) “The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States”

3) “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”

7) “To establish Post Offices and post Roads”

18) “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 16

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 1616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

“The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . .”

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

“The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . .”

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution. The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

“The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States”

Congress enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to help set water quality standards and permitting requirements. Making adjustments to this process, which provides for the general welfare, falls within Congress’ authority to legislative on items affecting the general welfare.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, “to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;” and Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, “to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to

Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries,"

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 1633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 1634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 1640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 12: Mr. WALZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 27: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 140: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 217: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 232: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 237: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 335: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 444: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 448: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 471: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 499: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 500: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 501: Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESTY, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 509: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 546: Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 592: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 595: Mr. PALMER and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 601: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 610: Mr. SALMON and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 619: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 653: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 662: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 663: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 670: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 685: Mr. TROTT and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 721: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 727: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 742: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 767: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 825: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 829: Mr. WALZ and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 842: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 868: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 902: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 906: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 919: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 940: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. BILI-

RAKIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 969: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 985: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1002: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1058: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1096: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1105: Mr. HARDY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. POMPEO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1114: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1125: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1151: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1161: Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1180: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1193: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1197: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HANNA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1206: Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1210: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1212: Mr. DENT and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1221: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1247: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1249: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1265: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1271: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1282: Mr. POLIS and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1299: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1301: Mr. PIERLUISI and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1323: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1339: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1340: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, Ms. MATSUI and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1349: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1365: Mr. McCAUL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1384: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1389: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1391: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1399: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1401: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HARDY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1404: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1408: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1415: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1458: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1460: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1465: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 1470: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1476: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 1484: Mr. HARDY.
 H.R. 1488: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 1498: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. WALZ and Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1502: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1506: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1527: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 1550: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VELA, Mr. LEWIS, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1560: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOBONDO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 1579: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. FLORES.
 H.J. Res. 14: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. TIPTON.
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 28: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 67: Ms. ESTY.
 H. Res. 139: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Res. 156: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

The provisions in Section 524 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 2, "To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes" do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 612: Mr. HULTGREN.