This misguided budget is a doubling down on the same failed policies that we know don't work and brought us to the brink.

□ 1830

What our ranking member did not point out is that there was a loss of 653,000 jobs in those 8 years where there was in the previous 8 years a gain of 20.8 million jobs.

You want to go back and use the same policies? You tried it in privatization. We're going to have it over and over again. You don't know what to bring up so you go back to the old playbook, which didn't work. You're saying that it's going to happen. It's going to work. One of these years we're going to try it.

The American people rejected privatization of Social Security, and they reject this. Every poll. Even your polls show that the American people do not want to do away with Medicare as it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, coming from the private sector to Congress, I know that America can and will become prosperous again and millions of new private sector jobs will be created if we just go back to our founding free market principles.

We must also end big government and wasteful spending. We're faced with two very distinct and different directions in which we can lead our country. It is clear that we cannot continue on the misguided and irresponsible path endorsed by the other side of the aisle of higher taxes, reckless spending, and bigger government, explosive debt and deficits, and unacceptably high unemployment.

They've had their chance to make things right, and it has not worked. Over the past 4 years that the Democrats had control of Congress, they lost 7 million jobs and raised our Federal debt by over $5 trillion. Now, it's our turn, and we will do better.

That's why this Republican budget plan comes at just the right time, because we can no longer afford to accept what has unfortunately become status quo. Rather than locking in reckless spending sprees that have cost our government, our budget plan cuts $6.2 trillion in wasteful Washington spending over the next decade. The Democrats' plan, which if left unchecked, will raise the deficit by over $9 trillion over the next 10 years.

We will put the Federal budget on a path to balance.

The President's own fiscal commission said that we need to lower tax rates and broaden the tax base in order to stabilize our Nation's finances and help grow our economy. The Democrats' plan ignores these recommendations and would impose job-crushing tax increases on our economy.

Nearly 1 million new private sector jobs will be created under our plan to lower taxes and expand the tax base, and our total employment will grow by an annual average of 1.2 million jobs per year over the next decade.

We have a clear choice, Mr. Chairman. We can take Obama's odyssey to American oblivion, or we can adopt a plan that restores America's promise and prosperity and security for our children and grandchildren.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–118, section 4(a)(3), the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1295(b) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101–595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), from the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), At Large.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by S. Res. 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105–275 (adopted October 21, 1998), further amended by S. Res. 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), amended by S. Res. 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), and amended by S. Res. 355 (adopted November 13, 2002), and further amended by S. Res. 480 (adopted November 21, 2004), the Chair announces, on behalf of the Republican Leader, the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 112th Congress:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), Administrative Co-Chairman.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), Co-Chairman.

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), Co-Chairman.

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), Co-Chairman.

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR).

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), from the Committee on Appropriations, and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), At Large, to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), from the Committee on Armed Services.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93–642, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation:

The Honorable ROY BLUNT of Missouri vice the Honorable Kit Bond of Missouri.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70–770, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senator to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress:

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH).

The message also announced that pursuant to provisions of Public Law 106–79, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senator to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we've been hearing for days about how the House Republican budget is courageous and bold. But this budget is neither courageous nor bold. It's not courageous to throw poor kids out of their Head Start classrooms but continue subsidies to Big Oil and their record profits.

It's not bold to slash Pell Grant scholarships to millions of students and to keep the incentives for companies that ship jobs overseas.

It's not bold nor smart to slash funds for new clean energy research and make future generations of Americans more dependent, not less, on dictators and dangerous fossil fuels.

And it's neither bold nor courageous to end Medicare for seniors, shifting thousands of dollars of costs onto the backs of the elderly to pay for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires.

For 45 years, seniors have relied on Medicare to provide health care during their retirement years. The Republican budget would end that guarantee. Seniors would no longer be guaranteed the coverage for basic health services like diabetes and cancer screenings. Instead, seniors would have to scrounge to find higher cost private health policies. What insurance company is going to write an individual policy for a 70-year-old that is even remotely affordable?

Because of these high costs, more and more seniors will go into debt under this plan. They will be forced to sell their homes and rely on their children to pay for basic medical costs. That is not a dignified retirement. That is not America.

Yes, we need to ensure that Medicare is sustainable for seniors and sustainable for the taxpayers. But one thing is certain—the Republican budget does not save Medicare; it ends it.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is not bold, and it's not courageous. It might be easy for the Republicans to make cuts on the backs of those who can't afford high-priced lobbyists. But it is not easy for the middle class working people and seniors on whose back the burden is being placed.

The Democratic budget is a fair and balanced approach, and it asks all Americans to share in the burdens in reducing the deficit and the debt and strengthening our economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the Republican budget to end Medicare and to vote for the Democratic budget that is fair and balanced.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Member from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This country's in a lot of trouble. We're facing a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportions. They say the first step toward ending an addiction is recognizing you're an addict. After spending 10 years here in Washington, D.C., after witnessing runaway Federal spending by both political parties, one thing is clear: Washington, D.C., is addicted to spending.

It's high time for Congress to own up to its spending addiction and institute long-term, sustainable budget and spending reforms that will permanently limit the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Happily, the budget resolution today offered by the distinguished Chairman PAUL RYAN of the committee puts our Nation back on a pathway toward fiscal solvency and prosperity. This Republican budget represents a bold step toward fiscal responsibility and limited government. It cuts $6.2 trillion in spending over the next 10 years, reins in government spending below 20 percent, includes tax reforms to increase competitiveness for American companies, and ensures that Medicare will be solvent for future retirees.

It even ends the one-size-fits-all approach to Medicaid, giving States more flexibility.

It also stands in stark contrast to the President's budget, which includes a $1.6 trillion tax increase on families, small businesses, and family farms, and adds $13 trillion to the national debt. This budget resolution renews our commitment to finally forcing Congress to live within our means. We must succeed in this cause. Because if we fail, the American Dream will fail.

We will burden our children and our grandchildren with a mountain range of debt, robbing opportunities and prosperity, and leaving, for the first time in American history, the next American generation worse off than the generation that went before.

This we must not do. I urge my colleagues to offer strong support for the Ryan budget resolution. Let's put our Nation on a pathway toward fiscal solvency and prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we do need to reduce the deficit in a predictable, responsible way. That will require spending cuts, and it will also require shared sacrifice. The reason that the fiscal commission said that the Republican plan was unbalanced is they try and do it all one way. History has shown that doesn't work.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

□ 1840

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we've heard this afternoon our debt is unsustainable, it's a warning, it's a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportions. But heaven forbid to try to solve those great problems that our country has right now, the problem that we have, we ask the wealthiest in the country to just pay a few more thousand dollars, those people who have seen tremendous gains. You know, cry me a river.

Here we have David Stockman, former head of the OMB under Ronald Reagan, talking about the budget being presented by the Republicans: ''It's simply unrealistic to say that raising revenue isn't part of the solution. It's a measure of how far off the deep end Republicans have gone with this religious catechism about taxes.''

We're asking for shared sacrifice. You're getting into Medicaid, you're getting into Medicare, you're getting into Pell Grants, but the wealthiest are going to walk away not sacrificing one thing. Three wars we're in, and we can't ask the wealthiest to pay a few bucks.

This ends Medicare, Mr. Chairman. Let's be honest. It ends Medicare. These people 55 and under, whose wages have been stagnant for 30 years, now when they get into the Medicare program, they're going to have a voucher or premium support that increases by 2.2 percent indexed to CPI, or 2.5 percent, and the GDP in health care will grow between 4 and 5 percent. So every single year that this person that's 55 is in Medicare, they will lose 2 to 3 percent ground in being able to pay for their own health care.

We need to go back and remember why Medicare started in the first place. It is not a good business proposition to provide health insurance to older people in the United States of America. You can't make money off it. So we're going to give these folks a voucher that doesn't keep up with health care inflation and send them into the private market and somehow think we're doing them a favor? No shared sacrifice.

Again, we're putting the burden on the middle class person who has paid into Medicare, depends on Medicare, has been getting wages that have been stagnant, probably doesn't have health insurance between 55 and 65. So you want to talk about driving up Medicare costs, now we add someone who doesn't have health insurance into a market that they won't be able to afford when they do turn 65.

This budget is wrong. We need balance. We need shared sacrifice. And we need investments in the United States. This budget comes up short, and David Stockman says the same thing.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say there is a new definition, and I want to explain it. Here is what a tax cut now means. If you're not in favor of the forthcoming tax increases, you're cutting taxes. That's the new math around here. What we don't do is we don't sign up for all these new tax increases that are being proposed by the President in his budget that are coming in the future. And so by not supporting new taxes, we're all of a sudden for tax cuts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. No, I will not yield.

What we are saying is keep the revenues where they are and fix the Tax Code, clear out the loopholes and the deductions so we can lower the rates to create jobs and economic growth.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also continue on this same conversation. The central question that we have to answer is do we have a debt and deficit problem in America or do we have a spending problem in America? Words like balanced approach, investment in America's future, and the often quoted ''shared sacrifice'' confuse the real issue. The focus of the House of Representatives is not about just reducing the deficit; it is about reducing spending so we can pay off the debt that we have.

Raising taxes on Americans now would be like the man who ran up a huge credit card bill and then went to his boss to tell him that he needed a raise to pay off his bills. His boss would most likely respond, You don't need a raise. You need to get your family on a budget and cut your spending to what is essential.

For the past 50 years, the Federal Government has taxed Americans at around 18.5 percent of GDP, no matter what the rate is. The current proposal from the President suggests a tax requirement closer to 22 percent of GDP. To close the deficit gap, all income taxes will have to double or corporate taxes will have to increase five fold. A tax increase on the wealthy may make some people feel better that they're sticking it to the man; but, historically, tax increases only lead to more government spending. And, ultimately, it will not solve the debt crisis.

Washington likes handing out other people's money for noble causes. Here is a novel idea: How about dealing with our existential problem? We spend too much. In 2009, 140,000 new Federal employees were hired. During the previous 10 years there was no change in employment in the Federal Government. The number of Federal contractors has increased 25 percent since 2006. In 4 years, discretionary spending has increased 25 percent. In that same 4 years, Medicare and Medicaid spending has increased by 50 percent. None of that includes the special TARP or stimulus funding, which would make the cost to the taxpayers even higher.

We cannot spend our way to prosperity. We have to get back to getting a handle on our debt and deficit and our basic spending. The reason the House budget has gained so much traction is that it does what Americans know in their gut must be done. It cuts spending.

Finally, someone is saying what many have felt. We cannot solve the budget problems quickly without significant spending changes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this is simple mathematics. When you went from the Clinton rates for the folks at the very top and you dropped the tax rate, we ended up losing a lot of jobs because of the economy. You also lose revenue. And when you do that, you shift the burden onto other people, whether you do it by cutting Medicaid, whether you do it by terminating the Medicare guarantee, or whether you do it by cutting education. That's just mathematics.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question of the chairman. Where in this budget is the sacrifice that is being made by the top 1 percent of the people? On the wealthiest 1 percent.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. First of all, we think we should go after corporate welfare. Let's stop subsidizing wealthy individuals and corporations with taxpayer dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, you are lowering the corporate income tax. What sacrifice is being made?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Like the fiscal commission, we believe that it's better for economic growth to broaden the tax base and lower the tax rate.

If I can continue on the gentleman's time.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there are two parts to the Tax Code. There is the corporate Tax Code. We need to clean up the corporate Tax Code. We agree with the fiscal commission. You've got to get out a lot of clutter, a lot of the tax breaks. In fact, we don't think you need a study to decide to get rid of the tax breaks that reward corporations for shipping American jobs overseas. We don't think you need to study the question about whether we get rid of big taxpayer subsidies for the oil companies.

So, yes, we should take a look at the corporate Tax Code. But in the other part of the Tax Code, the individual Tax Code, what the Republican plan does is actually give the folks at the very top another 30 percent break. We have been talking about going back to the Clinton rates. The Republican plan gives you another 30 percent break. You know what? They say we are going to do this in a revenue-neutral way. Well, the result is middle income taxpayers are going to pay more to give the folks at the top another big break.

With that, I yield 2½ minutes to somebody who knows a lot about this subject, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. We do not need to tear up what America has built in the past in order to build for the future. We should not confront present and future problems, including the Nation's deficit, as we must, by repealing America's past. The Republican budget tries to tear up and repeal 75 years of American experience, and the supreme example is Medicare. It tears it up. It repeals it. And contrary to what we've heard today, they would not save Medicare, but end it. They would not change it, but they would end it. Our Nation would be a different Nation without it. Millions today would be less healthy without Medicare.

□ 1850

One of my constituents wrote to me recently to say Medicare saved her life and her life savings when she was diagnosed with breast cancer, and there are tens of thousands of people like her in this country.

What the Republicans want to do is to give seniors a voucher for health care, an underfunded voucher, for 10 years. It would double health care costs for seniors, a voucher that in 20 years would pay only a third of senior health care costs.

There is no place to hide for anyone who votes for the Republican budget.

And what happens with the savings? Tax cuts for the wealthy. The average income of the bottom 90 percent of the families in America have fallen in the last decade.

The opposite is true for the wealthy. The top 1 percent have seen their incomes climb by more than a quarter of a million dollars.

In my district alone, extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans means giving 182 households that earn more than $1 million annual tax cuts averaging $103,000. At the same time, future seniors would be paying $6,000 more in health costs.

If what we have built in our Nation needs to be adjusted, fix it, don't destroy it. We must address the deficit without deepening deficits in the availability for our citizens of jobs, health care, and education.

The choice today could not be more decisive. A vote against the Republican budget is a vote for basic American values. Vote ''no.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget and Ways and Means Committees, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today as a proud member of the Budget Committee supporting our Path to Prosperity budget that was introduced on time and takes real steps to get the country's finances back on track focusing on real economic growth and job creation.

Lately we have heard a lot of demagogy and scare tactics about this budget. First it came from the other side of the aisle, and yesterday we heard those same remarks by the President.

But my constituents don't want to hear the same old partisan attacks and rhetoric. They want Washington to tell them the truth. The truth is this about our budget:

Number one, it's a jobs budget, and in the first year this budget creates 1 million new jobs.

Number 2, it cuts $6.2 trillion in government spending.

Number 3, it eliminates duplicative government programs.

Number 4, it preserves Medicare for the next generation.

Number 5, it puts caps on spending for the coming year and the next decade.

And, number 6, it takes us on a path to pay down our debt.

House Republicans are working to get this country back on track on a sound financial footing, and I am proud to be here today as part of the Republican majority that will lead where the President has failed and restore America's future growth and prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Small Business Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived, mean-spirited Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, all of us recognize the need to reduce the deficit, but it must be done responsibly. This budget fails that test, cutting services we need in favor of tax breaks for the wealthy.

For New Yorkers, these cuts will be particularly unfair. Ten billion dollars will be taken from low-income housing programs. Rental assistance will be reduced, making it harder for New Yorkers to find affordable apartments. This at a time when we are facing the worst housing crisis ever.

Housing is just one area where this budget fails our country. With Medicaid spending reduced by $735 billion, millions of Americans will find it harder to afford health care. Instead of tackling rising health care costs, this budget ends Medicare as we know it. Medicare is a promise to America's seniors. Whether we honor that promise defines us as a Nation.

Just as seniors will face tough times, this budget will visit hardship on young people. Head Start, child care and nutritional assistance for low-income families will be squeezed, and 26,000 college students from New York's 12th Congressional District will see tuition assistance reduced, putting college education out of reach.

Beyond slashing social services, this budget undermines our economic recovery. Small business lending would drop by $3 billion, depriving 5,000 firms of capital they need to create jobs. Is this the way we are going to create jobs in this country? Twelve thousand entrepreneurs and 9,000 veterans, those coming back from Afghanistan and Iraq, will lose business counseling services to help them launch or expand their businesses.

Mr. Chairman, we need a serious, thoughtful discussion about how to cut spending. Vote ''no'' against this bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Ways and Means Committee and former member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, this budget stops in its tracks the efforts of Democrat leaders to trap the American people on a high-speed train trip with the false promise of green jobs. This is a trip, a one-way ticket to bankruptcy.

However, if you support the Ryan budget, you will help this government recover from a debilitating and life-threatening illness that started when our leaders threw out the American way of life in favor of a left-wing agenda. Let's be clear. We have two choices: we can look forward and pave a path to economic prosperity, or we can become the world's most heavily taxed Nation in a dangerous, dangerous zone of bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, throughout modern history, socialists have been searching for the last exit to Utopia, of Big Government collectivism. Unfortunately, for the socialist utopians in this town that support President Obama's spending plan, this last exit to Utopia will remain a mystery, a relic of 1960s radicals.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, Republicans originally fought the creation of Medicare on the grounds that it was socialism. Apparently, they haven't changed their minds about that as they try and terminate it and put seniors into the private insurance market.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, health care costs are a crisis in every American family. Every family is one surgery, one heart attack, one cancer diagnosis, one aging spouse away from financial ruin. But health care costs are also a crisis for business, both small and large.

General Motors pays more for health care than for steel. That is why the Affordable Care Act is needed, to bend the health care cost curve downward for all American health care consumers.

Americans, including those who are consumers of Medicare and Medicaid, simply cannot afford the insurance and drug companies' runaway profits.

These companies are reaping record-breaking profits. In 2009, while we were debating the bill, the Nation's five largest for-profit health insurance companies saw a combined profit of $12.2 billion, and that's just for five companies.

Their executives did well, too. The top execs at these companies pulled in almost $200 million in compensation. At the same time, there were double-digit premium increases.

So no matter where you get your health care, through Medicare, Medicaid, your employers's policy, wherever you get it, you can't afford that kind of rate increase year after year.

These rates are going up faster than any other part of the family budget. For many people, these costs are crowding out housing and other basic needs.

In 2009, the top 10 pharmaceutical companies made over $60 billion in profits, and the profit margin in this industry is out of control. In 2007, profits ranged as high as 36 percent.

The health care reform law also curbed some of these outrageous profits of the insurance and pharmaceutical industries. Yes, Medicare and Medicaid are large portions of our Federal budget, but we can only rein in their costs if we fully implement the Affordable Care Act and tackle outrageous profiteering in health care—something the Republican budget refuses to do.

□ 1900

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the good people of Indiana want jobs. And we know how to create them. In Indiana, under Governor Mitch Daniels, we've seen a government that spends less and taxes modestly. We've seen that that leads to job growth. That's why Indiana, during these tough economic times, is a national leader in private sector job growth.

The Budget Committee crafted a budget for our Federal Government that, like Indiana, spends less and keeps a lid on taxes. The result is a plan that will help create 2½ million private sector jobs by the end of this decade.

Recent economic history isn't good to the big spenders. It shows that borrowing and spending trillions of dollars that we don't have doesn't create jobs. And jobs won't be created if we go along with the President's plan and, seemingly, the plan of sorts from the other side of the aisle to increase taxes.

It's no great secret that the job creators in this country aren't hiring because unchecked spending, of course, leads to fears. It leads to fears that we're going to have to raise taxes in the future. It leads to fears of future inflation. And we know, of course, that it leads to fears that interest rates are going to go up.

By calling for a measure of spending discipline as we do, we replace that fear with hope—hope that we can restore conditions where private sector job creators can go out and put Americans back to work. That's what the people of southern Indiana want.

Now, I mentioned Indiana a minute ago and the success we've had in creating those private sector jobs. We didn't do it all through our policies with respect to spending. Instead, we also looked at tax policy. We understood that it just didn't make sense to jack up taxes during a down economy. Instead, we kept them steady and we made our tax code more efficient, just as some of our neighboring States were doing the opposite. As a result, many businesses chose to move back to Indiana or to move to Indiana for the first time.

We see the reverse trend nationally. Unfortunately, many businesses are leaving this great country or just not getting off the ground because of our job-destroying Tax Code and because of our punitive corporate tax rates.

Mr. Chairman, we improve upon those previous policies. We learn from the errors of the past. I urge my colleagues to help us create jobs by voting ''yes'' on the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, at the heart of the Republicans' budget proposal is the thought, ''the number of makers diminishes and the number of takers grows.'' As a result, our government, economy and country will collapse. Forget about the impoverished view that this offers us, a vision of an America that can't be bothered or is unable to care for anyone who needs help.

So let's have a discussion about who truly would be the ''taker'' and who truly would be the ''maker.''

People who manipulate an unfair tax system at the expense of millions of others, makers, when you look at the Republican proposal. Corporations that don't invest in their own country, paying a lower tax rate on their profits than their employees would pay on a $40,000 salary, those are makers under the Republican plan. Wall Street firms that ruined our financial system, then asked working families to bail them out while they pay billions in bonuses, those are also makers under the Republican plan.

Yes, that's who the Republicans have identified as the makers, and it rewards them quite handsomely in their proposal. Their budget would perpetuate a taxation and employment system that has resulted in stagnant wages for workers and allows 5 percent of the wealthiest among us to enjoy 66 percent of all the wealth while 80 percent of Americans share only less than 13 percent.

Now, who would be the takers under this Republican plan? The 9.4 million students working towards a college degree so they can get a good job and contribute to this economy, whose Pell Grants would be slashed; 218,000 low-income kids and families who will be removed from Head Start, depriving them of a decent education, again, takers under the Republican plan; 2,400 schools that serve 1 million low-income students across the country that would have to shut their doors, takers under the Republican plan; countless seniors who would no longer be able to remain in nursing homes because of cuts in Medicaid funding. Those are the takers.

You decide, America, who are the takers and who are the makers? This is not a Pathway to Prosperity. It's a dead end.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. ROKITA.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, where the President has failed to lead and be honest with us, we've had the courage to tell the truth about America's debt crisis. And we've proposed honest solutions required to fix it.

As a new Member of Congress, I have already learned that the rules in Washington are stacked in favor of people who want to spend more money. In contrast, in Indiana, we have a balanced budget, we have a AAA bond rating, and we have not raised taxes because we know taxes are not the problem.

The problem is, Mr. Chair, our colleagues who continue to push for more government spending knowing that our debt is over $14 trillion and growing. And they haven't offered one alternative except to confiscate more of the people's money.

They have tried to scare a lot of people. But this time, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the people are buying it. As you can see from this chart, our reliance on foreign countries to supply our reckless spending is growing dramatically over the past decades to where nearly half of the debt we owe as a country we owe to foreign countries, China being the best.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, China can buy three Joint Strike Fighters every week for the money we pay them in interest for the money they loan us and still have $50 million left over. Eventually, they and other countries are going to stop loaning us money or make us pay more to borrow. And as Treasury rates increase, rates on mortgages, credit cards and car loans are soon going to follow. We are no longer kicking the can down the road; we're kicking it off a cliff.

This budget addresses the real drivers of our debt: Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. In 1970, these kinds of entitlements consumed 31 percent of our budget. Today they are nearly 60 percent, and they continue to grow. In just a few decades when our kids are raising their children, literally every single dollar this government takes in revenue will go towards paying these entitlement programs. This budget makes the changes necessary to save these programs so that they're around for my kids and your grandchildren.

I know a little about government agencies—I used to run one. One that had no more employees in 2010 than it did in the early '80s. But, since the President took office, he has added 155,000 new bureaucrats. Spending on government agencies has increased 84 percent in just the last few years.

This budget stops us from spending money we do not have. It brings spending back to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels and shrinks the federal bureaucrats by 10 percent over the next three years. It also takes the ideas of the Fiscal Commission and the Government Accountability Office and eliminates over $100 billion in wasteful spending on dozens of duplicative federal programs. Money we don't take from the American people, they will spend much wiser and create jobs along the way. Americans are finally getting an honest and fact-based budget that has eluded them for years.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members will refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the other things that China is doing is they're investing an awful lot of their resources in clean energy like solar power and like wind power. The United States should be winning that battle and not our international competitors. Someone who knows a whole lot about that is the next speaker, the ranking member on Natural Resources, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

The Republicans are allowing nostalgia for a time before Medicare and Medicaid were ever on the books to replace the idealism that we need to have in order to deal with the real challenges of the future. But for the poor, the sick, the elderly and the disabled, the past is just a memory and the future is their hard reality. And that's what this budget will be for those people, a hard reality.

It takes no courage for the Republicans to stand here on the House floor and to call for an evisceration of the Medicare budget, of the Medicaid budget and all the other programs for the poor, the sick, the elderly and the disabled in our country that they opposed ever having been put on the books in the first place. If you kicked this budget in the heart, you'd break your toe. GOP used to stand for ''Grand Old Party.'' Now it stands for ''Get Old People.'' And that's what this budget is. It is a targeting of the poor, the sick and the elderly in our country.

Do they ask sacrifice from the defense budget? Do they ask for the defense budget to go down? No, it just keeps going up year after year. Do they ask for sacrifice from the wealthy? No, they say tax breaks for the wealthy year after year after year. Who do they target? They target Grandma. They don't even have the ability—the courage—to stand up and say to the oil companies, who at $100 a barrel are making $100 billion in profits a year, ''We're going to take away your tax breaks.'' No. Tax breaks for oil companies stay on the books.

What do they do? They say to the clean energy industry, We're cutting your tax breaks by 70 percent, but we're leaving the tax breaks for the oil industry on the books and we are slashing the programs for wind, for solar and for all those energy technologies that are now the future.

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

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

□ 1910

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

That's your formula. It's a formula of the past. It's a formula for the nostalgic amongst the Republicans who wish we could go back to a time before Medicare and Medicaid and wind and solar and new energy technologies and their taking us on to a future.

Let me tell you something.

Fifty percent of the people who are in nursing homes in our country have Alzheimer's, and they are on Medicaid. That's how we pay for the bills. You people slash the budget for those people with Alzheimer's who are in nursing homes. That's 50 percent. That's grandma, ladies and gentlemen. You don't touch the wealthy. You don't touch the Defense Department. This budget is so cruel that, if you kicked it in the heart, you'd break your toe.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the warm, even-handed comments of my friend from Massachusetts.

Do you know what's really cruel, Mr. Chairman? It's if we give our children a lower living standard.

Do you know what's really cruel? It's if we give our children a debt-ridden Nation. It's if we give our children a debt that they can't afford.

Do you know what's really cruel? It's if we don't save Medicare. It's if we don't keep the promises to our current seniors, like we do in this budget, so that all of these programs they've organized their lives around, which are going bankrupt, are preserved. Medicare goes bankrupt in 9 years. We're preserving it for current seniors.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of The Path to Prosperity.

Our budget offers more than a spending blueprint for the next fiscal year and beyond. It is truly a job creator. The Path to Prosperity provides a framework for creating nearly 1 million new private sector jobs next year alone. How does it do this?

It doesn't involve advanced economic theory—just basic math. When you lower taxes, you put more money into people's hands. They spend it and it circulates, making businesses prosper and allowing them to hire new employees. It's just that simple. When I think of the opportunities that The Path to Prosperity will create, I think of countless small business owners who will benefit from this plan in my State. Small businesses are the backbone of New Hampshire's economy, much like they are across our great Nation.

I think of people like Craig Leonard, who owns Bonsai Craftsmen in Londonderry, New Hampshire. He remodels houses and kitchens. With the ongoing fiscal uncertainty, people are keeping their wallets closed because nobody knows what the next fiscal year will bring. Craig recently had to lay off three employees, and barely has enough work to keep himself busy. Without the confidence that can come from passing The Path to Prosperity, there is no telling when his business will return to prosperity, itself, and when he can dare to hire again.

I think of people like Charlie and Laura Morgan. They own a storage company in Manchester, New Hampshire. They've lost tenants in this down economy, causing them to reduce the rents they charge. This is simply keeping them from hiring additional employees and creating greater opportunities for our fellow Granite Staters.

The examples of hard-pressed small business owners I've cited are located not just in New Hampshire but all over the country. The Path to Prosperity provides confidence by charting a responsible course so that creditors can loan with confidence and so that people can borrow money knowing they'll be able to repay it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk on behalf of the people I represent in Michigan.

Many of them have lost their jobs, and when they become seniors, they're likely going to have to survive on fixed incomes. If they get Medicare on vouchers, which won't fully cover the costs of their health services, they're going to have to pay for that out-of-pocket. Do you know what? Folks on fixed incomes, they don't have the money to pay for these services out-of-pocket. They will likely end up bankrupt.

The other issue is that a lot of the folks I represent have got multiple health conditions: heart disease, diabetes, arthritis. They all go to different doctors, and very few of the providers actually talk to each other. They also don't coordinate with hospitals or with other long-term health care providers. All of these services by the Medicare providers will be coordinated under our new Affordable Care Act. That's why we need those provisions in place—to better coordinate health care.

I urge my colleagues to table putting Medicare on the voucher. Let's keep our Affordable Care Act. That's the best way our seniors on fixed incomes can get the best health care possible.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The ranking member of the Budget Committee, our friend from Maryland, talked about the fact that, according to his poster, the Bush tax cuts in the years 2000 to 2006 caused the loss of an untold number of jobs. I have my own statistics which basically show, during that period of time and despite those tax cuts, we had an increased revenue of something like $700 billion.

Now, I'll check my facts with his facts later on, Mr. Chairman, but how in the world could you produce $700 billion of additional revenue when you lose jobs? It's not possible. The fact is that those tax cuts created a broader base, albeit at a lower rate, and they generated more revenue. That's exactly what the chairman of the Budget Committee is talking about in his Path to Prosperity.

Another one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle stood up and said, according to this budget plan—at least, thank God, we have one. The Democrats couldn't produce one last year because of their fear of the political consequences—Medicare as we know it, by the year 2022, will disappear. How is that possible when, by that time, there will probably be 75 million people on Medicare as we know it before we will go to this premium support plan that Chairman RYAN has proposed?

Our friends on the other side keep saying, You keep giving tax breaks to the rich. Well, according to this plan, the people who are in the top 2 percent of income will only get 30 percent of the premium support, an average of $8,000 a year. The people in the top 8 percent would get 50 percent. So you keep wanting to beat on the producers in society that create the jobs.

Support this plan. It's a great budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my friend Mr. GINGREY that, when Mr. Bush became President, he inherited a $5.6 trillion surplus. By the end of the 8 years, it was gone.

Now, with respect to tax rates and jobs, what this chart shows is that, when the highest income earners in the country were paying the lower rates during the Bush administration, you actually lost jobs versus during the Clinton administration when, at the higher rates, 20 million jobs were created.

The point is not that higher tax rates increase jobs. The point is that small differences in the top tax rates are not the main drivers of our economy. They are not the main engines of job growth. The figures tell the story. Trying to tell another story is just anti-historical. The reality is that the numbers show, during the Clinton administration, we had very strong growth. During the Bush years, we ended up losing over 600,000 jobs. So let's at least get our history straight.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

□ 1920

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' misguided budget and attack on Medicare. The issue is not whether we reduce the deficit, but how we do it. Simply put, the Republican plan uses our deficit as an excuse to end Medicare as we know it.

Medicare is a cornerstone of the American Dream, a promise that health care will always be there for our seniors and permanently disabled citizens. But the Republican budget takes away that guarantee, and what does it give our future seniors in return? No guarantee of coverage; a real chance of being denied insurance due to preexisting conditions; and around $6,000 a year in additional out-of-pocket costs, as well as the knowledge that the insurance companies will be well taken care of while they are struggling to get by on their fixed income. And not one aspect of the plan will do anything to reduce the costs of care—it just passes the buck.

This is not a plan for our future. It is a recipe for disaster for our seniors. Forty-five years ago, when seniors were the most uninsured group in our country, we made a promise that health care for seniors would be guaranteed. The Republican voucher proposal breaks that promise.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have heard a lot of debate today about how we're slashing taxes, slashing revenues for the rich and for everybody else, and bad oil companies and things like that. Let me just show you a little chart.

Under our budget, revenues rise. Revenues go up over $12 trillion. So revenues still increase. Even keeping the Tax Code where we are today, revenues increase.

Now, the President's plan says he wants to raise them another $1.5 trillion. The gentleman from Maryland's plan wants to raise them another $1.7 trillion. But let's not kid ourselves: Revenues, even under our plan, continue to increase.

Now, we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem. The green line is the revenue line. The red line is the spending line. Revenues are stable, increasing; spending is on a tear, Mr. Chairman. Spending is growing at an unsustainable rate. We can't keep spending money we don't have. If we keep doing this, we're going to have a debt crisis. People are going to get hurt. Interest rates will go up. We will have to cut indiscriminately across the board at the time it happens. We want to avoid that.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 more minute, Mr. Chairman.

Let's talk about the Bush tax cuts, or what happened. Let's talk about the distribution of the tax burden. In 2001, the top 1 percent of earners paid 34 percent of the tax burden. Now they pay 38 percent; a higher tax burden. The top 5 percent in 2001 paid 53 percent of the taxes. Today, the top 5 percent pay 59 percent of the taxes. So on and so forth.

We don't have a revenue problem, a tax problem; we have a spending problem. But here's the real problem. If we don't get our situation under control, we really go in the hole. In 2009, the Government Accountability Office is telling us our fiscal gap, the unfunded promises we are making to current Americans, was $62.9 trillion.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 more minute to explain, Mr. Chairman.

That means we would have to take $62.9 trillion, set it aside, invest it at Treasury rates, just so government can keep the promises that it is now making to everybody in America. In 2009, we owed more than we were worth as total households in America. Last year, 2010, that fiscal gap grew to $76.4 trillion. Now, $99.4 trillion.

We are digging our hole more than $10 trillion a year by kicking the can down the road. Every year we fail to fix this problem, we are submitting our children to a worse future, a diminished country. So the sooner we get our act together, the sooner we fix this problem, the better off we're going to be. If we keep ignoring this, if we keep spending on the path we are on, this fiscal gap, the pile of empty promises that politicians from both parties have been making to Americans gets that much higher.

We have about $100 trillion of empty promises Washington is making to Americans. It is time we tell people the truth. It is time we get government to live within its means, and it is time we get Washington to honor its promises, fix these programs, get spending under control, and give our children a debt-free Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman is absolutely right. We need to come up with a plan that puts the country on a predictable, steady course of deficit reduction, and we need to do it in a balanced way.

The chart the chairman showed about revenues presumed we wouldn't have certain changes in the revenue. For example, that we wouldn't say to the wealthiest, we want you to pay the same rates you were paying during the Clinton administration when the economy was roaring and jobs were being created.

There is a reason the bipartisan fiscal commission called the Republican plan unbalanced. And this is what it is. Under the commission plan, they have a balance of spending cuts and revenue increases. For example, they say the folks at the top, they should be paying a little more. In fact, $2.5 trillion more over the next 10 years than the Republican plan. Because they don't do what the commission recommended, they have to cut into Medicaid, which will hurt seniors in nursing homes, disabled individuals, poor kids, everybody who depends on that already stretched program. They have to terminate Medicare. So those are choices they are making. They have made a one-sided, lopsided choice.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, we are in a debate of generational proportions. The promises that were made during the 1960s and before that, and even after that, about expanding our country, making it a greater country, widening its embrace, are now being abdicated. We are seeing a budget, offered by our Budget Committee chairman, that says to our seniors who have cut a path for all of us younger people, You know what? We can't be there for you any more.

We are seeing a budget where we say to our students, who are the intellectual drivers of our economy, we cannot be there for you any more. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of this budget, two-thirds of this budget, two-thirds of the cuts are from low-income programs that serve people who are making it, hardworking Americans who are trying to make it every single day. But that's where the cuts come from.

The question on the table is: What's the proper role of government? We believe the proper role of government is to look after our seniors. They believe grandma has to figure out what she is going to do. We believe that young people have to have an opportunity, and things like the Pell Grant are going to help them and help us. They believe if you are smart enough to go to college, you should pay for it by yourself, or maybe get a high-cost loan to do that.

We have a different vision of America. As a matter of fact, we have a vision that the people who are well to do and the corporations who have done so well should help out more. We believe in equity and a shared burden.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ELLISON. We believe in equity and a shared burden. In fact, the big five oil companies have received profits that are enormous when you look at them on this chart.

The gentleman keeps talking about tax reform. I would love to know, what corporate loopholes are you going to close? Are you going to close these Big Oil subsidies, or not?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me say that I want to be the first one to say we do want to close the tax loopholes for Big Oil. In fact, for the 4 years the Democrats were in charge, we're not sure why they didn't take it on. We are ready to take it on after this 4-year negligence on it.

Think about this, Mr. Chairman: For every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. Now, if that was happening in your family, you would bring everybody to the kitchen table and you would say, Look, we have got to make some changes here. We can't continue to spend money the way we are doing.

Today, the national debt is 90 percent of the GDP. Spending is approaching 24 percent of the GDP. That's a historic high. We can't get to a balanced budget with a spending gap that high above revenues, and yet that is what we are doing. That is why the Republican budget, the Ryan budget, not just reduces spending by $4 trillion, but changes the trajectory of spending. Because unless we change the pattern and we make some choices for the next generation, important programs like Social Security, like Medicaid, like Medicare, will not be there.

□ 1930

Too often we hear from the liberals in Washington, D.C., the scare tactics: Well, Republicans hate seniors, they hate clean air, they hate education. And that's what we're seeing here tonight. In fact, yesterday the President tried to claim a mulligan on his budget. He actually introduced a budget in February and did not bring in one recommendation of his own deficit reduction commission. Even though I've seen a chart on the floor tonight about it. It sounds great, but it's not in the President's budget because it wasn't presented.

We think it might be a good idea to use some of the recommendations of the deficit reduction commission, and that's what the Ryan budget does. But more importantly, it doesn't do anything to the important entitlement programs for anybody over the age of 55. Medicare will be there for them as it is today. But for younger people, it is not going to be there because it is going broke. That's why we need to make some changes. And giving them a subsidy to help them have more choices in Medicare is the way to save the program.

That's just one of the many aspects of the Ryan budget, and it's well worth supporting.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear my friend is interested in getting rid of the subsidies for Big Oil. We can do it tonight or tomorrow. All you've got to do is vote for the Democratic alternative. And, by the way, you can, at the same time, get rid of the tax breaks that reward companies for shipping American jobs overseas. We don't have to study about it. We don't have to send it to the Ways and Means Committee. We can instruct them tomorrow, tonight, and we will get it done if you vote for the Democratic alternative.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as Ronald Reagan used to say, ''There you go again.''

My Republican friends want to repeal the 20th century. They want to use the budget deficit to kill and destroy every program they have hated all these years, including Medicare and Medicaid.

This budget would roll back 50 years of progress on Medicare and Medicaid and destroy these two programs, which are two of the most important social programs of the past century. It's unconscionable that we would take an ax to these programs to pay for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires.

This budget shifts the burden from the wealthiest Americans and puts the burden on the poor and middle class. I understand that my Republican colleagues want to protect their rich friends, but on the Democratic side of the aisle, we care about working people, the middle class, poor people, seniors, and children.

The Republicans last year promised they'd focus on two things if they got the majority: jobs and spending. But all we have seen are repeated attacks on the middle class and lower-income people. We haven't seen a single jobs bill, and their idea of cutting spending is to kill Medicare and Medicaid. Instead of passing this budget, we would be more likely to create jobs by waving a magic wand and saying ''abracadabra.''

In this time of divided government, the American people want us to come together and compromise. But all the legislation we're seeing from the other side is extreme. We need to come together. We do have difficulty. We don't want our children to have a diminished standard of living. But this is not the way to do it, to try to balance the budget on the backs of poor people, on seniors, on children. We need to have a fair and balanced budget.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Rules and Budget Committees, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I tell you we see a lot of shrill things here on the House floor. I want to have a slightly different voice. I just want to tell you how proud I am to be here—how proud I am to be here because, as the gentleman who previously said very accurately, I ran on two things: I ran on cutting spending and I ran on creating jobs. And tonight, because of the hard work of my chairman on the Budget Committee, my colleagues on the Budget Committee, I get to vote tomorrow to do just that—just that. I have been here a hundred days, and I get a vote to change the direction of this country, from driving us off the edge of the cliff to restoring the freedom and economic success that we're known for the world around. A hundred days and I get to make that choice.

Now, I'm thrilled, in the spirit of openness, that we have some alternatives. If you want to raise taxes, you're going to have budgets to get to do that. But if you want to close $2.9 trillion in tax expenditures, in loopholes, in lobbyist-funded giveaways, you've got one budget to choose from, and that's the Ryan budget.

We go after those items that, for whatever reason, folks hadn't gone after in years past. We do those things that, for whatever reason, people couldn't find the courage to do in years past. Vote after vote after vote I presume people had to vote on things they didn't like to vote on. They didn't want to run up spending. They didn't want to increase the debt limit. They didn't want to do those things. But they had to do it.

Folks, tonight I'm here to talk about something I want to do. I cannot wait to come to this floor tomorrow and cast a vote for my children, for America's grandchildren, for the future of this land. And that's a vote in favor of the Ryan budget. I am grateful to my colleagues for giving me that opportunity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I welcome our friend from Georgia, and I would just say that we agree on one thing: that this budget does pose a fundamental choice. And that's what we're here to debate about. And we believe that it's just wrong to be providing another round of big tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans when you're ending the Medicare guarantee, when you're cutting investments in kids' education. Those are choices that we shouldn't be making.

We are going to present, and have presented, a Democratic alternative that we think provides a balanced approach.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I am so glad you picked me at this time because I want to join the previous speaker in saying that the atmosphere and the attitude here is just too shrill. If we're dealing with the lives and the futures of the generations to follow, it should be in a different way. We should not just be fighting with each other.

So I make an appeal to ministers and priests and rabbis and imams to try to figure out, as we go into these holy holidays, whether or not the screaming is going to help or whether or not we're going to find ourselves with the lesser among us.

I don't know the whole story, but it runs something like: I was hungry, and you didn't give me anything to eat; I was thirsty, and you didn't give me anything to drink; I was sick, and you didn't visit.

Well, it sounds like the answer that's going to be given is: Well, I told the State to take care of you. I'm sorry they didn't. Or, Don't you remember? I'm the guy that gave you a voucher. Or, I pulled myself up by my own bootstraps. Why can't you do it without a scholarship?

No, I think not. This great Nation was built to believe in God we trust. And it just seems to me when you're talking about the lives of our mothers and our grandmothers and the future of our children that all of the things we hoped and dreamed about, it's not going to be shattered by political budget ventures put together by the majority. If it's not stopped here, it's going to be stopped in the Senate or stopped in the White House. But I hope those that are listening that are involved in providing spiritual care, that recognize how important health care is for our sick and our poor, why don't you just write your Congressperson and share with us whether or not you think that we have an obligation to protect the wealthy among us rather than the lesser of our brothers and sisters.

We will be going home for a couple of weeks during these Easter holidays, and I do hope that all of us try to find out which side are we on: the rich or the lesser among us.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I appreciate Chairman RYAN for bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, basically the entire discussion that we're having in Washington right now centers around two figures: We spend 3.5 T, trillion, and we bring in 2.2 T, trillion, in revenues to the government from taxes. Now, it's the bringing together of those numbers that's a difference of opinion here in Washington.

I read the text of the President's speech yesterday—I did not get a chance to listen—and he says that we can close that gap by taxing the millionaires and billionaires. And it sounds so fluid. It comes off so easy. But I will tell you, it's a process that many nations have followed before: tax the millionaires.

I don't know what Bill Sweat in Artesia is worth, but he tells me to create a job it costs $340,000 to buy a new bulldozer and he needs a new pickup truck. So he needs $400,000 in the bank to create a job.

□ 1940

Now our friends on the other side of the aisle—and the President's speech—said we need to be taxing that money away from him. NANCY PELOSI said a couple of years ago we need to tax the profits of the corporations and spend them. But what you do is you take away Mr. Sweat's $400,000 and he doesn't get a new bulldozer, and we don't get a job.

So what we have here is this differential, $1.3 trillion in deficit on these top line figures. That's what we're accruing. Then that goes into our debt barrel, $15 trillion. That's what we have over the life of our country, from George Washington until today, approximately $15 trillion, and we're bringing in 2.2.

Now if we begin to give the tax increases that the President says, we're actually going to squeeze down to 2.2 because companies will not be hiring people. For instance, off the shore of Louisiana, we are now choking off those jobs. And so every job off Louisiana that the government kills takes one person from paying taxes and puts them up here receiving welfare, unemployment and food stamps.

Economic growth is the only thing that can cure this Nation's economic problems. The Ryan budget does that. The President's budget does not do it. Let's support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I have to show us this chart again because I just need to remind the body that during the Clinton administration, when we had the folks at the very top paying a little bit higher rate, 20 million jobs were created. When that rate was dropped for the high-income earners at the beginning of the Bush administration, not only did it contribute to deficits going up, but at the end of that period over 653,000 jobs were lost.

Now the point isn't, again, that by changing the tax rate that was the driver. The point is that small differences in tax rates are not the main engines of economic opportunity. And we need to make choices here. Again, they choose to provide tax breaks to the folks at the very top and end the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who has been a champion of Medicare, Medicaid, and a whole number of other issues important to our seniors and Americans.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Republicans are trying to claim the mantle of fiscal responsibility today. It's just ridiculous. They are the party responsible for a decade of fiscal recklessness with two unpaid-for wars, two unpaid-for tax cuts, and a blind eye to Wall Street leading to a disastrous recession. And as the President said yesterday, ''There's nothing serious about a plan that claims to reduce the deficit by spending $1 trillion on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires.''

This chart illustrates that, from 1979 to 2005, the bottom 20 percent of households saw their incomes increase by a grand total of $200. Over the same period, the top .1 percent here in the red saw income growth of nearly $6 million each year.

There is nothing courageous about a plan that would protect the wealthy and Big Oil and big corporations that ship jobs overseas at the expense of elderly and their Medicare and their Medicaid and the disabled and children.

The Republican budget resolution does not reflect the values of Americans, and I urge my colleagues to reject it soundly.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Unshared prosperity, spending money on tax cuts. Mr. Chairman, the presumption behind that is that all the money out there made in America is the government's, and then the government decides who they spend it back to.

We do have different philosophies. The money that people make is their money. And then the question is: How much of it does the government take?

The money made in America by individuals, by businesses, is their money. It's not the government's money. So we don't spend money on tax cuts.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, we're not even cutting taxes in this bill; we're just not raising them. So the new definition of cutting taxes apparently is: If you're against raising taxes, you're cutting them.

I don't even know where to start with this, but I'm going to start by yielding 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, we clearly have a choice here in Washington: We can maintain the same old status quo, which favors more spending, more taxes, and more Washington control, or the real American choice, making good on promises made to voters last year by cutting spending and creating jobs. The choice is ours; the opportunity is now.

The Path to Prosperity offers a long, overdue fix to Medicaid. There are many problems with the program, and the costs are out of control, hemorrhaging the budgets of State after State and our Federal Government. Clearly, the answer is not more money; instead, the solution is spending money more wisely and more efficiently.

Governors from all across America have expressed their desires for more flexibility with Medicaid, and this budget offers exactly that. In converting Federal spending on Medicaid to block grants, folks closest to the American people—Governors, legislators and local officials, not some bureaucrat sitting in Washington—will make decisions best for their citizens and design programs that work best for their States and for their people. They will have the freedom to adapt Medicaid to their own State's unique needs and priorities.

Also, because this budget defunds ObamaCare, we are preventing the Federal Government from imposing another mandate on the States. ObamaCare forces States to expand Medicaid eligibility but leaves it up to them how they will pay for it. By supporting this budget, we put a stop to this intrusion of the Federal Government and make Medicaid better for those who truly need it.

This Path to Prosperity will increase the Medicaid budget and provide much needed regulatory reform for the 50 States of this great Union. Only those committed to the status quo—including many of our colleagues across the aisle—can make the ridiculous claim that somehow spending more taxpayer money and pushing more Washington red tape is somehow a solution. By lifting the heavy hand of Washington from Medicaid, we make this program more effective and more efficient for the States to manage these programs and provide compassionate care for the Americans who truly deserve assistance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, hardworking American people have been paying their Medicare payroll taxes day in, day out, month in, month out. The choice we have here is whether we are going to make good on that Medicare guarantee or whether we're going to say to the folks at the very top, We just can't take you back to the tax rates that were in place during the Clinton administration.

Why would we say that to people who have been putting their payroll taxes into Medicare? Why would we say we're going to end the Medicare guarantee?

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, unlike the gentleman from Wisconsin who just doesn't know what to do and seems to be confused on his side of the aisle as to what his budget is all about, I will say that I am getting unconfused because his budget is a destruction of the fabric and the way of life of all Americans.

Do you want to know what the Republican budget does? It cuts food assistance for struggling families; it takes away affordable health care coverage for working families; and, of course, it dismantles the health care safety net. But also, it deals with the education of our children.

As the cochair and founder of the Congressional Children's Caucus, let me show you what happens when we don't educate our children. We can see the numbers of individuals who are unemployed who have not had a high school degree. Our friends and the Republican budget are going to cut education, and they're going to wind up with increasing unemployment because you can see that less of our Americans are being able to go to college, and, therefore, without college, without a high school education, we just undermine a growing child's opportunity.

Let me tell you what else we do. We go from children to their grandparents. I remember standing on the floor of this House trying to prevent the doughnut hole from coming about, but Republicans again established a doughnut hole that millions of seniors have fallen through. In fact, the Republican budget causes seniors to pay some $12,000 on their Medicare. Listen to me clearly, seniors, you will be paying an extra $12,000 with the Republican budget plan. And of course we will open up the doughnut hole again, the very doughnut hole that has been taken care of by the Affordable Care Act.

On the other hand, the Democratic budget balances the budget, and of course it recognizes the value of a shared sacrifice. I just visited Texas soldiers, National Guard. They understand about shared sacrifice; they support each other. But this is a suicidal budget. It has no shared sacrifice, and all of the cuts come from the most vulnerable.

The Republican plan is all about turning back the clock and throwing the poor people over the bridge. That is what it's all about. It is a disgrace. Vote for the Democratic Budget.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Republican Budget for Fiscal Year 2012 and beyond. Unlike the proposed Democratic Budget, the Republican Budget purports to reduce our nation's deficit by making disturbingly deep cuts to important programs and will have an adverse affect on our nation's families, children, and the health of women.

The Republican Budget:

Guts Food Assistance for Struggling Families. The budget resolution calls for $127 billion in cuts to SNAP (formerly called food stamps) in a six-year period (2015 through 2021). This proposal to block-grant and reduce funding represents a cut of 25 percent in food benefits for some of the most vulnerable Americans. States will be forced to cut benefits to some households or create waiting lists for needy families.

Takes Away Affordable Health Coverage for Millions of Working Families. The majority's budget resolution calls for $1.4 trillion in savings from repealing coverage provisions of the Affordable Care Act, which Congress enacted a year ago to hold insurance companies accountable and extend health coverage to more than 30 million Americans who would otherwise be uninsured. This would mean repealing $777 billion in tax credits to help low- and middle-income families afford health insurance coverage.

Dismantles Health Care Safety Net for Vulnerable Populations. The majority's budget devastates health security for 28 million poor children, 5 million seniors, and 10 million disabled individuals who rely on Medicaid for a basic safety net of health care.

To protect tax cuts for the wealthy, the budget includes the absurd idea to dismantle the Medicaid program and to let the chips fall where they may, no matter who might get hurt. The real hard choices are left to others: state governors, who will decide which populations or health services to drop; health care providers, whose Medicaid payments might get cut so low they will have to decide whether they can afford to continue providing services to Medicaid beneficiaries; low-income families, who may have to decide between buying groceries and taking a sick child to a doctor; and adults with aging parents, who may have to decide between sending a child to college or paying for their parents' long-term care.

The Democratic Budget:

Democratic budget reduces the deficit responsibly, reaches primary balance by 2018. The Democratic budget reduces the deficit by $1.2 trillion more than the President's budget over ten years.

Includes Pell grant and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP) initiatives. The Democratic budget includes two mandatory initiatives that are fully paid for with spending reductions. First, it includes the President's proposed mandatory funding to sustain the maximum Pell grant award at $5,550, in contrast to the Republican budget, which cuts Pell grant funding substantially.

The Democratic Budget protects Medicaid and the Medicare guarantee for seniors. The Democratic budget protects Medicare's guarantee of health care coverage for seniors and disabled workers. It also preserves the existing structure of Medicaid that provides a health care safety net for vulnerable children, families, seniors, and persons with disabilities. In contrast, the Republican budget dismantles Medicaid and ends Medicare by converting it into an inadequate voucher for the purchase of private insurance.

I would urge all Members of Congress to oppose the Republican Budget and instead support the Democratic Budget to responsibly cut spending and give America's families, women and children a chance.

□ 1950

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. This is a little surreal to walk in the Chamber and be able to hear that somehow Republicans are interested in throwing old people off the bridge and that somehow old people—that we're focused on all of these things: that we hate those in poverty, and we hate our own parents, and we hate all of these other things.

In reality, as a newcomer walking into this body, I walk into a Chamber saying, We came to get things done. And the driving factor that I walked in this Chamber with is the reality that we have $14 trillion in debt. Now, that's hard to be able to wrap your head around, $14 trillion in debt. So the way I try to wrap my head around it is with an old illustration from me personally.

I remember being 9 years old watching the Voyager spacecraft take off and thinking it will take forever for the Voyager spacecraft to get all the way up to Saturn and to Jupiter. It would take all of 10 years to get out there. But I remember when those pictures were done, and they were sent back, and how significant they were.

Now, just imagine this: in 1977 when the Voyager 1 spacecraft took off, if it started dropping a dollar a mile from the time it took off, how long would it take it to drop $14 trillion? Now, remember, the Voyager spacecraft has been out 34 years. It is still operating. It has left the solar system now. It is past Pluto, headed out of the solar system. If it dropped a dollar a mile since the time it took off, it will drop $14 trillion 41,801 years from now. A spacecraft that's already flown out of our solar system will have to continue flying at the same speed another 41,801 years from now.

It is surreal for us to stand here and to be able to not take seriously the amount of spending that we do and how out of control we really are. This is not just a tax problem. This is a long-term issue that's not Republican and Democrat. We have both spent too much money. It is time for us to pull our own budget back and to take this seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I, too, remember the Voyager spacecraft and also the Apollo program and Moon launch. Great examples of things that individuals and corporations can't do by themselves, things that we have to do by coming together as a people behind a purpose.

The Republican budget, if you look at the long-term forecast provided by CBO, essentially says when you project out here, given the assumptions they were given, you eliminate all of the Federal Government except defense—and even defense is at a smaller share of GDP when you get out there than it is today. That is the kind of result that you get.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That is because GDP growth grows at a faster pace than government. So it is not as if government goes away. Government keeps spending; government keeps defense and education. It's just that the economy outgrows the size of government, and we're on a virtuous path to more prosperity, more opportunity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Reclaiming my time, look, the issue here is what is the appropriate role and size of government. There is no doubt that we have to take what we think should be a balanced approach that involves both cuts and, as the fiscal commission, the bipartisan fiscal commission says, you've got to deal with the revenue piece if you're going to do deal with this problem in a realistic way.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate it. Let me commend you for the excellent leadership that you are providing in this fight.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is America. This is the greatest country in the world. And we are great because we have certain values. Paramount among those values is the sense of fairness.

Now, let me tell you what the flaw is in the Republican budget. The flaw in the Republican budget is it is not fair. Whatever polls we read, wherever we look, the American people are beginning to see it. How can you justify cutting seniors, cutting young people, cutting the low-income, cutting the middle class while at the same time giving over a trillion dollars to billionaires and millionaires in this country? That is the disconnect, Mr. Speaker.

I don't care which side you're on or where you are in this country. The American people know that we, yes, must bring down our deficit and cut this debt. It has become a national security issue.

For 8 years since I've been in Congress I have been arguing for that, standing up for paying down our debt. During the years of the Bush administration, which, let's tell the truth, was a primary cause of us being in the position that we're in now to have three wars going at the same time.

And so ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion I'm just saying that the point we have to make is it is not fair to cut this budget on the backs of the poor, the elderly, and the young while at the same time giving billionaires over a trillion dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will give myself a minute to simply say again just to clear up for the record, if you're a person who is 55 years of age or older, there's no change in Medicare for you. The Medicare you're on or that you're organizing your life and getting ready to prepare for when you retire will be there as it is forever for your life under our proposal.

Contrary to the status quo. Medicare goes bankrupt in 9 years. Status quo, the President has a new board called the Independent Payment Advisory Board; 15 people he appoints. They ration Medicare. They put price controls in Medicare. They decide what Medicare can do or what it can't do. Congress is out of the loop. Unelected bureaucrats by the President, his people, they do it. And the President just yesterday said, You know what? Go cut more. Go get more savings. That's the status quo.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for the exceptional leadership he has been bringing to this House on this issue of the budget.

I want to say I agree with my colleague from Georgia. We are the greatest country in the world. We also have the smartest people in the world, and they're not going to buy this demagoguery anymore.

The President and Democratic political strategists are engaged in demagoguery of the worst sort. Yesterday the President accused us of wanting to leave sick kids to fend for themselves. But we've heard this before.

On the eve of the 1996 welfare reform, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG voiced his concern that the bill would transform America into a Third World nation leaving ''children hungry and homeless, begging for money, begging for food and even at 8 and 9 years old engaging in prostitution.''

Senator Carol Moseley-Braun trumped Lautenberg by wondering aloud whether the welfare reform bill would prompt the widespread auctioning of abandoned children into slavery. Jill Nelson of The Nation did them one better by predicting that ''working- and middle-class communities all over America will become scary, violent wastelands.'' Representative JIM MCDERMOTT made a more prosaic prediction that within 2 years of enactment, the bill would ''put 1.5 million to 2.5 million children into poverty.'' Even Daniel Patrick Moynihan warned that the law would ''have children sleeping on grates.''

□ 2000

What happened? Child poverty rates fell by 1 percent per year in the 5 years following the passage of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act, and they remain below 1995 levels, even though the Nation is still emerging from a severe recession. Transforming welfare, by among other things block granting the program and giving States more control over its implementation, cut caseloads in half against a backdrop of falling poverty rates. In almost every particular, the critics were wrong.

The aim of the social safety net should be to empower individuals, putting them in stronger position to achieve. Government can play a positive role in this area with policies aimed at helping those who are down on their luck get back on their feet.

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

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

Ms. FOXX. This budget strengthens the social safety net and promotes policies that help people recover from poverty and lead self-sufficient lives.

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

Mr. Chairman, we ask every American to read this budget, this Republican budget, and see whether or not it reflects their values and the choices that they would make. We believe when they do that they will reach the same conclusion that the bipartisan fiscal commission did, which is that it's simply unbalanced, it's simply unfair. It puts all the burden of the sacrifice on working men and women. And it does provide those folks at the very top once again—we've seen it before—with a big tax break.

When it comes to Medicare, it's a fact seniors are no longer going to be able to choose to stay in Medicare. They're going to be forced into the private insurance market with ever-increasing costs and ever-declining support. That is rationing care. That's what insurance companies do. If you don't have enough money to buy the benefits that they are offering, you don't get them. If your doctor's not on that plan, tough luck.

So those are the choices that we're making this evening. And I hope as we go forward the American people will look very closely at this proposal. I'm confident they'll reach the same conclusion the bipartisan fiscal commission did, which is it's just not balanced, and it doesn't reflect American values and priorities.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes, Madam Chair.

Now, let's take a look at what our drivers of the debt are: Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare. The health care entitlements are the biggest drivers. The black line here shows our revenues. These three programs alone take up all Federal revenues. You throw interest on top, which you have to pay interest, by 2035 they consume every single penny of every Federal tax everybody pays.

Now, why are we proposing what we're proposing on Medicare? Because we have experience that this kind of thing works. Giving people more choices, having more competition works. Prescription drugs. That's a program, very successful, very popular. When that program was passed, it was projected to cost $634 billion over the budget window. It ended up costing $373 billion. It came in 41 percent below budget. Premiums are lower than were anticipated. Name me one other government program that actually came in 41 percent below cost projections. There isn't one. Why did this one do that? Choice, competition. The senior is in charge.

We are not interested, Madam Chair, in giving control over Medicare to 15 unelected people to decide where, when, how, and under what circumstances they get their Medicare. We protect Medicare for current seniors. We deny the 15 people on the board the ability to ration their care. And we want 40 million seniors to have the choices. We want them to be in control of their Medicare.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Because what we have learned is that giving them more control, the senior, the beneficiary, the patient, not the government—competition works. We've tried so many different plans at rationing care. They don't work. One person does work to reduce prices: The consumer. That is why we are saving Medicare.

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

I have to say that to say this plan saves Medicare is in my view Orwellian. It does remind me of the phrase from many years ago that you have to destroy the village in order to save it. I have to say that if you look at what we're doing here, you're saying to seniors you've got to go into the private insurance market.

Now, the chairman mentioned a couple other examples of the private market. But in this case we've already experimented, through Medicare Advantage, with that kind of private plan within Medicare. And you know what we discovered? That you had to subsidize them at 114 percent of the fee-for-service program. It cost us more for Medicare Advantage. In fact, one of the reforms that we made as part of the Affordable Care Act was to say we're not going to ask the taxpayers and folks who are on Medicare fee-for-service to subsidize those private plans that are running over cost. And you know what? In this budget our Republican colleagues kept that reform. If it was so great to have the Medicare Advantage plan, how come they took part of the savings from that plan? They did not.

So it is a big mistake to say to seniors we're going to throw you into the private insurance market with an ever-declining voucher premium. The reason this isn't premium support, it doesn't support the premium. What Federal employees and Members of Congress have is a premium support system through a fair share formula. This is not a fair share for seniors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I will just simply say we do actually put $10 billion back into Medicare Advantage to make sure the program stays alive.

I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chairman, as a freshman I guess I am a little confused here on the floor of the House listening to this debate about the budget. And I guess I am a little confused which party was in charge of this Chamber for the last 4 years as we ran up trillions and trillions and trillions of deficits. The concern wasn't about deficits. The concern was about spending and how much more could we do, and how much more could we throw into the economy. We look at the results today: Unemployment levels that we haven't seen for a long time, Madam Chairman.

I guess as we debate and discuss this budget, of course we might be a little bit rusty. It's my understanding it's been a couple years since we even allowed a budget debate on the floor. I welcome that debate. But one thing that was mentioned, read the Path to Prosperity. I agree. I agree with my colleagues, please read the bill. Please do. And here is what you will find.

A Path to Prosperity we believe runs not through Washington, not through this floor, certainly not through the other Chamber, but the Path to Prosperity in this country runs through the hard work of entrepreneurs, a flatter, fairer tax system, closed tax loopholes, regulatory reform, work rather than welfare.

The result is this, Madam Chairman. We expect a million new jobs potentially might be created if we get Washington out of the way, as we see in the Path to Prosperity.

Madam Chairman, ideas have consequences. And we believe, this plan believes in one thing, in the power of the American people, not Washington elites. This plan, this budget is about liberty and freedom, Madam Chairman. I hope and pray 2011 will be remembered not for what we do here, but for whether or not the end result of our actions will help us restore the American Dream in this country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), former insurance commissioner for the State of California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, for 8 years I was the insurance commissioner in California. And for 8 years I battled the health insurance industry. What we heard on the floor was that 2011, what will we remember? What it will be remembered for is the death of Medicare, the demise, the death of Medicare. The most successful insurance program, the most successful health insurance program in this Nation.

□ 2010

It works. It is efficient. It is effective. It is a nationwide standard policy available to every American 65 years of age and older and some of those who are younger.

I heard the author of this bill a moment ago saying competition would make it better. In fact, it does not. In fact, it does not.

The private health insurance industry is inefficient. It is ineffective, it is discriminatory and it clearly, clearly harms customers. There is a profit motive that has to be paid for. There are compensations for the sale and compensations for those who sell the insurance. All of that adds up.

It is also extremely inefficient in that there are multiple policies, multiple people that have to be paid, insurance companies that have to be paid, different deductions, different copays. All of that is out there.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GARAMENDI. My Republican colleagues have done everything they can to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, which had insurance reform in it. Without the insurance reform, which clearly they want to do away with, you are throwing senior citizens to the sharks, to health insurance.

I urge us not to do that.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would simply say we have new data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on national health care expenditures. In 2009, the last year we have data available, Medicare costs grew by 7.9 percent. Private health insurance plans costs grew by 1.3 percent.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will not yield to the gentleman.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chairwoman, as a freshman in this House, it has been unique to sit and see one of the age-old tactics that takes place, scaring seniors, not to move the ball down the field, but for political points. The gentleman was just referencing Medicare and telling the American people that it's not broken, that it's going to continue to work.

These are CBO charts. If you take a look at them, it's broken. We can't afford it.

We have to reform this program to save it, and to deny that is trying to scare seniors for your own political gain, and I think that's shameless.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFY. No, I won't.

I think we have to be honest with the American people, come out and say you know what, this is a program that if we can reform it, we can save it for our retirees. But not only that, those who are about to retire, 55 and older, we can save the program for them as well. And we can modify the program for those of us in later generations.

But let's not try to scare our seniors tonight and tell them that this plan is going to take away their care, because it's not. This plan, and its proposal, is that those who are 55 and older are going to continue to get the same plan that exists today.

The reforms are for future generations, and with those reforms we are guaranteeing that current retirees get the benefits that we promised them. If you say you care about our seniors, you would join with us, and we would all work to resolve this issue and make sure our grandmas and our grandpas continue to get the benefits that our country has promised them.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2¼ minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7¾ minutes.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I am glad I had the opportunity to speak after my freshman colleague from Wisconsin.

I was down on the floor earlier. I walked back to my office. I asked Mr. Maroney, who is answering the phones in my office, What are you hearing about? Are you hearing about the continuing resolution?

He said, No. I said, Are you hearing about the budget debate? He said, Not really. I said, What are you hearing about? He said, I am hearing from seniors who are scared. I am hearing from folks on Medicare who are scared.

Now, who does that surprise? It doesn't surprise me, and I don't know what the goal was when we went down this scare tactic path. I will say to the ranking member, I know you know better.

You've got a persuasive case to make, a persuasive case to make for why your vision is better than our vision, but you're scaring people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I will yield to have the gentleman tell me if anyone age 55 or older will be affected.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Isn't it true that the Republican budget reopens the prescription—

Mr. WOODALL. If the ranking member is not going to answer my question, I will not yield. You should be ashamed.

I reclaim my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And that's because you don't like the answer you're going to hear.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. WOODALL. I reclaim my time to say we have honest debates here. We have honest disagreements here. But folks are scared because you're scaring them and you know good and well you don't need to.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I want to associate myself with Mr. DUFFY's comments that we could get together and solve this problem, or we can just choose to scare people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield, I will answer his question.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I will yield to the gentleman to tell me if anyone age 55 years of age or over will have their benefits changed in any way.

The Acting CHAIR. Will all Members please suspend.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, they will have their prescription drug benefit changed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Point of order ma'am.

The Acting CHAIR. Will Members please suspend.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, the House is not in order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chairwoman, I wanted to speak very briefly to a topic that was raised earlier tonight by my colleague, Mr. ELLISON from Minnesota. It is a comment, a message that has been repeated several times tonight and was, in fact, repeated several times during the committee process, which dealt with the subsidies that we give to Big Oil, to oil and gas.

I will tell my folks, especially my colleague from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), that I share the frustrations that you have with those types of subsidies. I also share the frustrations that I have with other members of my conference that alternative energies receive seven times as many subsidies in the Tax Code as oil and gas. In fact, if you take the subsidy, the excise tax credit for ethanol, that number rises to 10 times.

So I do share your frustrations with the amount of tax credits that the code currently gives to oil and gas. But I am 10 times as frustrated, Madam Chairwoman, with the subsidies that we give to alternative energies.

I would invite, Madam Chairwoman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have that same frustration to join us and vote for the budget. It's the best chance they are going to get this year to get rid of these subsidies as part of this process of closing the loopholes, lowering the tax rates and broadening the base.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We've had a spirited debate this evening about fundamental choices that we need to make as a country. We all agree that we have to reduce our deficits in a predictable, steady way. The question is how do you do it, and we believe, as did the co-chairs of the bipartisan fiscal commission, that the Republican plan is unbalanced; and it's unbalanced because it asks very little of the folks at the very top and reduces dramatically our investments in our kids' education and it does end the Medicare guarantee.

Seniors will no longer be able to stay in the Medicare program. They will be forced into the insurance program. It immediately does end the prescription drug benefit, something we worked hard to close, the doughnut hole.

□ 2020

It ends the effort that was put in place under the Affordable Care Act to end the doughnut hole. So I would say to the gentleman from Georgia who spoke earlier, those seniors who are calling his office, they will lose that benefit in closing the doughnut hole right away if this Republican budget passes.

For other seniors and people who have been paying in the Medicare system through their payroll taxes, we want to make sure they have the benefit of the Medicare guarantee. Throwing them into the private insurance market and giving them a deal that Members of Congress do not give ourselves is wrong. It is absolutely wrong.

We have a fair share deal, and we are asking seniors to take a raw deal. We have a true premium support system for Members of Congress where the Federal Government shares the risk of increasing costs. Under the Republican plan, they are asking seniors to do what they don't want Members of Congress to do: take all the risk of the rising costs.

Those are not choices that reflect American values and priorities. We should not be giving tax breaks to the folks at the top and ending the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

First, let me say with respect to the Medicare guarantee, we keep hearing that. As you know, because we've said it over and over again, in our budget—by the way, go to budget.house.gov if you want to read the plan. I encourage people to please do that.

With the new Medicare plan with people 54 and below, it's a Medicare guarantee. The plan you will be given to select from, just like a system that works like the one we have, like the prescription drug benefit plan, they are guaranteed plans. You are guaranteed to get them if you want them, and your subsidy is guaranteed.

Now, we simply say, wealthy people shouldn't get as much of a subsidy as everyone else. Lower income people should get a bigger subsidy. And as people get sicker, they, too, should get a bigger subsidy to protect their premiums.

And I would simply say the greatest danger, enemy and threat to Medicare is the status quo. Medicare goes insolvent in 9 years.

But let me look at this from a different perspective. We've had a lot of debt before in our country. When you buy a house or a car or get a business loan, you get debt. What matters is how big is your debt relative to your ability to pay it. What also matters is: Who are you borrowing it from? Are you borrowing it from your local community bank? Are you borrowing it from your brother-in-law? Fine.

Where are we borrowing our money from? We used to lend it to ourselves. Americans would buy T bills and lend it to ourselves. In 1970, 5 percent was held by foreigners, 95 percent by Americans. In 1990, 19 percent of our debt was held by foreigners. Today, 47 percent of our debt is held by other countries. Number one is China. We are borrowing 42 cents of every dollar today, and half of that from other countries, the number one being China.

Look at where we're headed. We have a crushing burden of debt. The debt goes to double the size of the economy, then triple the size of the economy, to eight times the size of the economy. The CBO tells us the economy crashes in 2037. Their computers can't figure out how the American economy can grow past the year 2037 because of the debt burdens.

We can't keep borrowing money from other countries to cash flow our government. We are giving them our sovereignty. We are losing control of our own destiny. We are giving our children a debt prison.

Why is this happening? Because politicians from both political parties have been making promises and promises that are empty. We need to get government to live within its means. We can't keep spending money we don't have.

By the way, you don't fix this by raising taxes and raising taxes and raising taxes. You fix this by cutting spending—novel idea. I know it is in Washington.

So we're going to start. We're going to start by cutting $6.2 trillion in spending. We're going to start by putting the right policies in place to grow the economy. We're going to start by keeping the promise to people who have retired so that their Medicare and Social Security is there for them. We're going to start by saving these programs for future generations so they're not empty promises. We're going to start by preserving our social safety net and making it more adaptive, resilient and sustainable for the 21st century.

We want to repair the social safety net so it works. And we want to gear it not toward keeping people on welfare, but getting them back on their feet into lives of self-sufficiency so they, too, can flourish and reach the American Dream. We're going to start by passing this budget so that we can give our children a debt-free nation, so we can maintain the legacy of America, which every generation prior to ours upheld, which has given the next generation a more prosperous America, a better chance, a better chance at securing the American Dream.

If we don't do this, if we don't fix this, if we don't make the tough choices now to get this under control, we will be the first generation to sever that legacy. And, Madam Chair, that's a disgrace. It is within our control. We see this coming. We know what's happening. We know why it's happening. And if we don't fix this before it gets out of control, shame on us.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This country is starved for truth-tellers, people in Congress who will just tell them what the problems are that this country faces, give them options and help them make the right choice, people who are strong enough to lead and bold enough to lead at a time when the country needs leadership. When it comes to the budget, when it comes to the economy where the President has failed, House Republicans will lead.

The Paul Ryan budget helps spur job creation in America today. It stops spending money the government doesn't have. It lifts the crushing burden of debt. This plan puts the budget on the path to balance in paying down the debt over the long term, and it puts the economy on the path to prosperity.

Let's talk about the economy. It is the number one concern of most people, and the debt and deficit have a lot to do with it.

We are undergoing one of the worst recoveries we've seen in a long time. It is two to three times slower than the Reagan recovery, and there is reason for that. We were told by the President and congressional Democrats that if we just spent money, spend it in the stimulus and spend it in increased deficits, that the economy would recover. And they were wrong. After spending hundreds of billions of dollars on the stimulus, we have 2 million fewer jobs in America today than when the stimulus began. We have fewer jobs today than when all that spending took off.

We were told if Congress passed all the stimulus bills that our unemployment rate today would be 6.8 percent. It's 8.8 percent. And it's only that low because so many people have given up simply looking for work anymore. They've lost hope. And then finally, for those who say we just spend more to create this economy, they were off, their predictions, by 7 million American jobs.

It's time to stop listening to the economists who got it wrong and start listening to economists who got it right.

□ 2030

Let's take a look at what spending has done to our economy in America. Here is a chart. It looks back on the last 40 years in America, and it tracks Federal Government spending against job creation along Main Street, not government jobs but jobs in the private sector, the small-, medium-, and large-sized businesses that our economy depends upon. The blue line is government spending. The red line represents jobs along Main Street. You can tell with the blue line. Look at how different job creation is. In fact, over each of these four decades, not only is there no correlation between Federal spending and jobs along Main Street, but it's a negative correlation in each of the 4 decades. As government spending goes up, jobs along Main Street go down.

Look at this next chart. We also went back the last four decades in America and asked about private business investment. What happens when companies large and small buy new equipment, buy new software, buy new buildings, and invest back in the economy? Here is the chart. The blue is the private, fixed investment from business. The red is job creation along Main Street. As you can tell, it's a very close correlation.

In fact, there is no substitute in America for private investment in the economy—no substitute, no rebates, no stimulus, no shovel-ready projects. Nothing is a substitute for creating jobs like getting businesses to invest back in their workforces, in their workplaces and in the economy.

Recently, I had the Joint Economic Committee take a look at the economic studies over the last 40 years of our competitors around the world, competitor countries that got themselves into debt trouble but that worked their way out of it. You would be interested in the results of this study, and there are three key points to it.

One is that the countries that were most successful in getting their debt down, in getting ahold of their financial paths, didn't do it by raising taxes. That didn't succeed. They did it by reducing spending. That's how they best and most successfully got ahold of their debt. There were 21 times that 10 different of our global competitor countries got a handle on their debt successfully by reducing spending.

The second takeaway from this study, called ''Spend Less, Owe Less, Grow the Economy,'' was that countries that got ahold of their debt the right way also grew the economy as well. Economists agree that the countries that get their financial houses in order grow their economies over the long term. What this study shows is that, with our competitors, if you get a handle on your spending the right way, you grow your economy in the short term as well.

Here is Canada. Neighboring Canada got themselves in financial trouble. Their economy was growing at a paltry pace, less than 1 percent a year. They lowered their debt as a nation by about 12 percentage points, and their economy took off. For almost 16 years, they've averaged economic growth of almost 3½ percent.

Sweden, another developed country with an economy like ours, actually had an economy that was shrinking. It was actually contracting. They got ahold of their financial house and put that in order as well, reducing their debt by more than 11 percentage points. Their economy took off, growing 3½ percent a year, on average, for almost a decade. New Zealand did the same.

You may say, Look, we're not Canada; we're not New Zealand; we're not Sweden. Yet 26 times, nine of our competitor countries around the world that lowered their debt by reducing spending grew their economies strongly, not just in the long term but in the short term. They didn't grow them a little. Those countries rocketed to the top quarter of economic growth in the world. Countries that reduce their spending and do it the right way grow their economies.

Here is a third and another, again, telling point about this, which is that not all spending cuts are the same. When it comes time to grow the economy, not all spending cuts are the same.

What these economists showed is that the nations that grew their economies the most successfully undertook cuts that were large, credible and difficult to reverse. So they made cuts in savings that mattered, and the cuts in savings that grew their economies made sense. They shrunk their Federal workforces. They right-sized them to what they could afford. They eliminated duplicate programs, obsolete programs—as a business would—programs that waste money. They reduced subsidies to corporations which were interfering in the free marketplace. Finally, they tackled their entitlement reforms in health care and in pensions. What is interesting is that, even if the reforms they made in their entitlements didn't affect their current beneficiaries and even if they phased those reforms in over time, the reforms sent the right signals to the marketplace.

Then what happened in each of these countries is that businesses, in no longer facing higher taxes because of all that spending, felt comfortable getting to reinvest back into their workforces, back into their countries' economies. Households like ours, in no longer facing higher taxes to pay for all these spending sprees, felt more comfortable buying larger ticket items, like cars and houses. As we know, when businesses invest, jobs along Main Street grow. It has been made clear time and time and time again, like businesses, countries that can get ahold of their debt, that can do it the right way and that can put themselves on financially sound paths grow. America's economy can grow as well.

The budget resolution presented tonight by Chairman PAUL RYAN meets the test that spending reductions must be large, credible and difficult to reverse once made to boost our economy:

The Ryan budget attacks the medical entitlements that are driving Federal spending higher. It attacks corporate welfare by phasing out government guaranties to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It eliminates subsidies for green energy, and it reduces agriculture subsidies by $30 billion over the next decade. The Ryan budget rolls back nonsecurity discretionary spending to its 2008 levels and then freezes it for 5 years.

It adopts a number of the recommendations from the President's own fiscal commission to eliminate waste and to achieve real savings in our budget. It eliminates agencies and programs identified by our own government as wasteful and duplicative. That alone will save over $100 billion in the next decade.

It reduces the Federal workforce. It right-sizes the Federal workforce by 10 percent over the next 5 years by attrition, simply by hiring only one new Federal employee for every three employees who leave or retire. Together, that saves almost $400 billion.

The Ryan budget envisions a pro-growth tax reform that lowers the top income tax rate for both individuals and companies to 25 percent and makes us competitive again in this world.

The Ryan budget is a fiscally responsible plan that accelerates economic growth and job creation. It is a game-changer for this Nation and tells the truth about our challenges, and addresses them with ideas and proven solutions that move us forward.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I think it's very important for us to understand and remember how the economy here grew and how it became much more positive and progressive during those 8 years of the Clinton administration. The deficit that Clinton inherited when he came into office was dramatically reduced and brought back a surplus. When he left office, the national debt was in the neighborhood of a little over $5 trillion. By the time the next President left, George W. Bush, the deficit was about $10.7 trillion. So it's important for us not to have the same kind of experience now that the opposition here on the other side of the aisle is trying to push on us.

The most critical challenge that we face as a country, of course, is the need to create new jobs. If Congress hopes to get the economy moving at the right pace, we are going to have to take this challenge of job creation very seriously. The question is: What should we do? What should we not do to reform government so that we can better compete in the world economy and yield strong, sustainable, long-term growth and prosperity?

After 100 days, Republicans have failed to put forward a single plan to create jobs. Instead, they have laid out a budget plan that shows us exactly what not to do.

□ 2040

We must remember how we got into this budget mess in the first place. While my friends on the other side would like to pretend that our economic woes began the very second that President Obama took his hand off the Bible and was sworn into office, we know that is not the truth at all.

In fact, it was quite the opposite. The things he did as President were positive for the economy, and we are seeing that today. We are seeing the economy growing. We are seeing unemployment declining. We are seeing employment going up, all of that as a positive effect of the actions of this President.

My friends on the other side pushing this budget are the same people who carried President George W. Bush's agenda through Congress, and in doing so nearly doubled our national debt, as I said, from about $5.7 trillion to $10.7 trillion over the 8 years of the Bush Presidency.

We need to make sure that they are not able to do that again. They did so then by recklessly lowering taxes on the wealthy with the promise that doing so would create jobs and strengthen our economy. Well, we know that neither of those happened. In fact, just the opposite occurred. They did so by passing a prescription drug plan that is a major giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry without finding a way to pay for it. And they did so by taking us into Iraq under false pretenses and committing us to what will ultimately be several trillions of dollars.

Now we are seeing economic inequality at record levels. The wealthiest 10 percent of the population here in the United States of America receives nearly half of all income in our country. And the richest 1 percent has seen its share of the national income increase by nearly 10 percent; and they are now at about 35 percent of all income, all of that increasing for the richest and declining for working people across this country.

This trend has consequences, and it is no coincidence that the last time we saw inequality at this level was during the Great Depression in the 1930s. But instead of working to correct this problem, the House Republican proposal acts as a huge wealth transfer program from the working class Americans to the rich. Overall, two-thirds of the cuts the Republicans propose take dead aim at working class Americans to lower their economy and lower their economic conditions.

The Republicans' budget plan eliminates Medicare, forcing seniors to buy insurance in the private marketplace, using a coupon that barely covers a fraction of the cost of care. It cuts food stamps, Pell Grants, and low-income housing. And at the same time, our friends across the aisle here, their plan would give away $2.9 trillion in tax cuts to the hugest, biggest corporations and to the wealthiest Americans.

This is the exact wrong approach, and it will severely damage our economy, hurt the middle class, and impoverish senior citizens.

Let's take a closer look at how this plan hurts seniors. Their budget eliminates Medicare. It eliminates Medicare and creates a new voucher program that would saddle seniors with a large portion of their health care costs. They would then be more responsible for it, and the whole health care system would decline.

The Republican budget also makes prescription drugs more expensive for seniors. The health care law we passed last year is gradually eliminating the gaps in prescription drug coverage. The Republican plan undoes this essential reform, forcing seniors to pay out of pocket. The Republican budget also threatens to make nursing home care unaffordable by cutting $771 billion from Medicaid over a 10-year period. Medicaid currently covers nearly half of all long-term care costs, and we know what would happen if their plan was to be successful. All of that would be essentially eliminated. The Republican budget also cuts $10 billion from Social Security's administrative budget, which will impact service to seniors.

What this plan does to America's seniors is absolutely unacceptable; but the worst part of it is that while they cut Medicare and Medicaid and they cut prescription drug coverage and the Social Security Administration, they also cut taxes on the very wealthy, reducing substantially the amount of taxes that the wealthiest people in this country pay while at the same time raising taxes on everyone else.

Now, 10 years ago, the conservative Heritage Foundation projected that in 2011, 1.6 million more Americans would be working as a result of the Bush tax cuts. They were wrong. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. We know what happened then, just the opposite of what they predicted.

The Republican debate isn't about good policy or the facts. It is about a dogmatic approach to governing and doing what's best for the very rich, doing what's best for the very rich regardless of how it affects everyone else who are the main promoters of the economy. Working class people, middle-income people are the people who drive the economic growth here in America. If they are forced to decline their economic conditions, then the whole economy of this country declines. All of that is needed to be understood, and the actions that they are proposing must be avoided.

Even President Reagan's budget director, David Stockman, recently said that he finds it ''unconscionable that the Republican leadership, faced with a $1.5 trillion deficit, could possibly believe that good public policy is to maintain tax cuts for the top 2 percent of the population.''

We know that isn't the case. We know that is going to be just the opposite. We know that tax cuts for the wealthiest, making the wealthiest people in this country even wealthier and driving down the economy of the working people, is going to have a deadly effect on the economic circumstances across this country.

Tax rates are now lower than they were, even under President Reagan; and yet the Republicans are actually proposing to cut taxes again for the very rich, lower the corporate rate, and keep special tax earmarks for Big Oil, tax earmarks for Big Oil which is now growing to be one of the highest growing economic aspects of this country that we have to deal with. Tax earmarks for Big Oil and for the biggest companies, and the biggest companies particularly that export jobs overseas, continuing to give tax cuts to those economic companies that take jobs out of the United States and exports them to other countries. What a big mistake that is in the context of rescinding this economy.

Overall, the Republican budget plan for 2012 will not balance the budget; and while it does not balance the budget, it eliminates Medicare by replacing it with a private voucher program that will make it impossible for seniors to get health care. It also provides huge new tax breaks for the wealthy while cutting key investments in our economy.

All of these proposals that we are facing here are clearly deadly. If they were to be successful, the economic circumstances that are now just getting better in this economy as a result of the actions by the Obama administration would be reversed, and it would be reversed dramatically, and we would see a downslide in the economic circumstances here in our country.

□ 2050

We need to oppose this effectively, and we need to have a policy that is going to focus its attention on working class people, on the need to create more jobs, and to create more jobs more effectively.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would remind the listeners that it was Democrats who fought the prescription drug program for our seniors; who last year slashed a half-trillion dollars from our seniors programs, which will hurt our local hospitals, our nursing homes, our hospice programs. They're going to drive 7 million American seniors out of their Medicare Advantage plan. And yet they failed to lead to preserve Medicare for every generation once and for all. They failed; we're going to lead.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, when I travel my district, I have tried to figure out a way to explain to people, and to myself, how to make sense out of these trillions of dollars. And I do it this way. I put it in numbers that I can understand.

I tell folks to assume that you're a family who brings home $46,000 a year, and you sit down at the beginning of the year to do your budget, and when you add up all of the things that you spend money on, you're spending $78,000. And then I say to them, When you're doing that and you're making $46,000 and you're spending $78,000, I want you to realize the Visa bill in the drawer is $281,000. And that's where we are as a Nation.

And I tell them, as we try to figure out a way to save money, I remind them that the first thing that we did in this Congress was we cut $35 million from our own budgets. To lead by example, we cut our own budgets in this House by $35 million. And in that world where you're making $46,000 and you're spending $78,000, and you're trying to find $32,000 of savings in your household, that $35 million represents 70 cents.

That's how big the numbers are. And I think the folks back home have started to grasp it. I certainly have started to grasp it.

But I do get some good questions when I give that presentation on the road. Some folks will ask me and say, If I was in that position at my household, not only would I try to cut expenditures, but I'd also try to get another job. I'd try to make a little bit more money.

And I said, That's a really good point and that's what most families would do. With government it's different. With government the only chance they have to get that additional job, to get more money to come in, is to raise taxes. And when they ask me why don't we just raise taxes, I say because it simply doesn't work. It simply does not work. It has never worked.

This graph shows the top marginal tax rates going back to the 1950s. For those of you who were around or studied the era, the top marginal rates in the 1950s were actually above 90 percent. The top marginal income tax rate in the 1950s was above 90 percent. And the government was still only able to take from the economy about 20 percent of the economy; 18½ percent is the average over the course of the last 50 years. So even when tax rates were as high as 90 percent, the government took only about 18, 19 percent of the economy out in taxes.

That number has stayed bizarrely stable over the course of the last 50 years. We've lowered marginal tax rates; we've raised marginal tax rates. Yet the government only takes out 18, 19, at the most 20 percent.

Raising taxes does not bring in more money to the government over the long haul. It may for a short period of time. It may for a year or two. But the world doesn't work on a static model. The world works on a dynamic model. And when you raise taxes, the economy grows slower, and eventually we get back to this 18, 19 percent average.

By the way, I made this presentation in a debate to a former member of the Clinton administration. And the moderator, after I had mentioned that we've never been able to get more than 18, 19 percent out of the economy, turned to that member of the administration and said, Is that true? How do you respond to that?

And the member of the Clinton administration said, You know, he's absolutely right. We have not been able to figure out a way to do it in the United States of America, even with high top marginal tax rates.

But they do it in Europe. They do it in Europe. In Europe the governments can get 30, 40, even 50 percent of the economy away from the private sector, away from people, and put it in the pockets of the government.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. MULVANEY. And I put it to you, Madam Chairwoman, that that's what this debate is really about. That's what this debate is really about. Are we going to maintain the American system, or are we trying to move towards a European system? And I will tell you that that's really what this fight is all about.

And the budget that we're here defending tonight, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, is the budget that defends the American system, that defends the system that says the government really should only take 18 or 19 percent away from the private sector, that that's enough, that we don't want to be Europe, where people pay VAT taxes and people pay much higher rates of taxation. The government takes 30, 40, or 50 percent. And what the opposition is offering is a European-style model.

So I simply ask my friends on both sides to consider what kind of country we want to be. Do we want to continue on as the America that we've known for years, or do we want to become Europe? And I suggest, Madam Chair, that the former is the better course of action.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, we've heard a lot of discussion here this evening about what economic policy works, where do the deficits come from. Let's just figure it out.

Beginning with this man over here— I think we would all recognize him— that would be Ronald Reagan. After every year, at the end of the year, the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan, makes a projection of what's going to happen in the next 10 years. At the end of Ronald Reagan's period, they did their projection, and they said, voila, a $1.4 trillion deficit in the years ahead. Followed by George Bush the senior. At the end of his 4 years, they did another estimate: What's going to happen in the next 10 years? Well, let's see. That says a $3.3 trillion deficit. How about that?

We were just talking about some economic policy here a minute ago. Well, let's talk about the Clinton period. At the end of the Clinton period, 8 years, another projection was made by the Congressional Budget Office: What's going to happen in the next 10 years? A $5.6 trillion surplus, enough to pay off all of the American debt.

How did it happen? How did it happen?

It happened this way: Early in his administration, they set about to deal with the deficit. There was a tax increase. It cost my Democratic colleagues the House. But they did it. They put it in place. And they also put in place PAYGO and the balanced budget amendment. What happened was that in those 8 years was the largest job growth in America's history except in the 1950–1960 period. It was enormous job growth. More than 20 million jobs were created and extraordinary revenue growth.

So much for the argument we just heard.

In fact, a combination of holding tight on the budget together with a tax increase worked. I was part of that administration, and we were told to reinvent government. We did. At the Department of the Interior, we reduced the number of employees from 90,000 to 75,000, and we maintained and actually increased the efficiency and the effectiveness of that Department. It can and it was done.

However, let's take a look at George W. Bush, the most recent Bush presidency. At the end of his presidency, the Congressional Budget Office did their estimate, and they came up with an $11.5 trillion deficit in the years ahead.

How did it happen? It happened this way: He cut taxes year one, 2001, cut taxes. Year two, 2002, cut taxes. Two wars unpaid for, borrowed money from China, and then backed away from all regulation of Wall Street, and the great crash. The result: An $11.5 trillion deficit. The day Barack Obama came into office, he was handed a $1.3 trillion bill due. That's what the Republican President gave to this Nation and to this Congress. So we've set about solving it.

Now I want to move to another issue here, which happens to be this debate about Medicare. You're not going to solve the Medicare problem, which is one of ever-increasing cost in the underlying health sector of America. When I first got into this in 1991 as insurance commissioner, 9 percent of the American economy was in medical services. This year it's approaching 18 percent. You cannot solve this problem by throwing senior citizens off Medicare. It does not solve it.

□ 2100

Do not throw the seniors to the wolves. The wolves are the insurance companies. I know. I was the insurance commissioner for 8 years, and I fought those characters every year I was in office. I know what they will do to seniors. They will rip them off, they will deny benefits, they will deny coverage, and they will not control cost.

In California this year, insurance companies are raising costs by 20 to 40 percent. Medicare went up 6 percent. Medicare is efficient. Medicare is efficient. It is a nationwide policy. You can get it anywhere in this Nation. There is no administrative cost that even comes close to what the insurance companies' administrative costs are, perhaps 30 percent of the premium. Profit, sales, expenses, all of those things added up, and that includes the chaos at the delivery, the medical delivery. We need to change that.

You want to deal with something more? Take a look at this. This is Medicaid. In Medicaid, the Republican budget intends to cut Medicaid by three-quarters of $1 trillion in the next decade. Who gets Medicaid? Senior citizens and the disabled. The aged, blind and disabled get Medicaid. And this is immediate.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm just getting warmed up.

Who gets Medicaid? The aged, the blind and the disabled get Medicaid.

The Republican budget cuts Medicaid three-quarters of $1 trillion. Seniors will be—not 10 years from now, but immediately, as those budget reductions take place, according to the Republicans—thrown out of nursing homes.

I just finished a conversation not more than 2 hours ago with the owner of nursing homes in California. He said, Don't let them do it. We're just hanging on. Any further reductions, any reductions in the Republican bill will force us to send out of our nursing homes the Medi-Cal, which are people covered by Medicaid.

Who are these children? These are the children in poverty. The children in poverty get medical services from Medicaid, and Medi-Cal in California, 20 percent. Are those the people you want to throw out in the street? You will do it.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Yielding myself 30 seconds, I would remind our colleagues that are Democrats that Congress slashed a half trillion dollars from our seniors' care, including nursing homes, just last year. I will also remind our colleagues that Medicare is insolvent. The biggest threat to our seniors today is to do nothing.

Democrats and the President failed to lead. Republicans are not only going to preserve Medicare as it is today for those 55 and older, but for the younger generation, we are going to give them the choices and the options to preserve that program for them for their entire life.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to a new member of the Joint Economic Committee who understands that government doesn't create jobs, it is the private sector that creates jobs, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Chairwoman, in reference to one of the charts we just saw from the gentleman from California, I found it interesting that he laid out many different debts and deficits from prior Presidents, but the one he failed to present to this House was the one from President Obama. On the day that the President took office, we were projected, over the course of 10 years, to borrow $1.8 trillion, from the CBO, and today we are projected to borrow $9.4 trillion. We have inherited now a fiscal mess.

Let's review where we're at. This country owes $14 trillion. This year we are going to borrow $1.6 trillion. Last year we borrowed over $1 trillion. The year before that we borrowed over $1 trillion. Let's look out 10 years. For the next 10 years, on average, we're going to borrow $1 trillion every single year. This is unsustainable. We cannot continue on this course.

Listen, I wasn't a big fan of President Bush's spending, but his biggest year of deficit spending was $460 billion. That pales in comparison to the $1.6 trillion we're going to borrow today. I mean, I know we've all seen these charts so often, but this is our debt chart from the CBO. We have a sea of red, a sea of debt that we are going to leave off to the next generation. This is unconscionable.

What does this mean for future generations? This means higher interest rates. This means massive tax increases. This means a lower standard of living for our next generation. And I guess I will present to this House, if you were to ask your grandma and grandpa what they thought about leaving this off to our next generation, they would be outraged. They would be furious that this is their legacy, that this is what their grandchildren are going to inherit. We need to fix the problem.

Let's talk about the budget proposal that has been made.

Congressman PAUL RYAN and the Budget Committee, they propose reducing spending by $6.2 trillion over the course of 10 years. Yes, they also talk about tax reform, a fair, flatter Tax Code. And you know what? We have to realize this isn't 1980. We are in a global marketplace. We compete against China and India, Mexico, Vietnam.

And you know what? This isn't just against Kansas and Kentucky. We have to engage. We have to have an environment where our businesses can compete, succeed, and win. And when they do, who benefits? The people that benefit are our families because they have jobs, they have opportunity. But if we build walls around this country with more mandates and more regulation and more taxes, we are going to see more businesses go overseas and fewer jobs for our families. And as we've been talking about tonight, we will have less revenue in the Federal Reserve.

I've heard a lot this evening, Madam Chairwoman, about Medicare and a lot of demagoguery across the aisle about what it's going to do. Let's be clear with the American people. Let's be honest with the American people that if we don't reform Medicare, the CBO says it's going broke in 9 years. We have to fix it. We have to fix it to make sure we can preserve it for our current seniors. So let's not sit here and scare people and tell our seniors we're taking away their Medicare. We are not. We are working on solutions that are going to preserve it.

And so when we talk about reform, to be clear, we're not talking about reform for our current seniors or even those who are about to retire. The reforms we are talking about are for my generation. And what's beautiful about this is if we reform Social Security, we get to guarantee the benefits for our current seniors, but then you allow me to plan for the benefits I'm going to have when I retire. And if we do it, we can succeed in this reform.

We've heard a lot about taxes as well. And so we all know here that the top tax rate, 35 percent, and a family who makes $350,000 a year falls into that tax category. And so I would, Madam Chairwoman, suggest to my friends on the left, why don't we do this. Let's bump that tax rate up—not to 35 percent, maybe 50 percent. No, let's go 100 percent. Let's take every dollar of a family that makes $350,000 a year or more, let's take every single dollar from them. And if we do that, we still can't balance the budget. So let's go to the next level. Let's go to the next highest rung of income earners, those who make $200,000 or more as a family. A mom makes $100,000; a dad makes $100,000. We would all agree they're wealthy. Let's take 100 percent of every dollar they make as well.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DUFFY. And if you do that, you still can't balance the budget.

You cannot tax your way out of this problem. We have to reduce our spending. If we reduce our spending and we reform our Tax Code, we can bring prosperity back to this country. But to sit here in this House and tell the American people that we can tax our way out, the bottom line is you can tax every penny of every profit of the wealthiest Americans and you can't balance the budget.

Madam Chairwoman, I think we have to take a serious look at Congressman RYAN's budget. I'm willing to consider other commonsense solutions that are going to get this country back on track, but ones where we are going to demagogue plans and say we just have to raise taxes and not reform are not real solutions. That is going to give us more of the same.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

The gentleman from Texas mentioned the fact that as part of the Affordable Care Act last year we made some reforms in Medicare. Yes, we did. We got rid of the overpayments to the private plans, the Medicare Advantage plans. Why did we do that? Because they were costing the taxpayer 114 percent of the fee-for-service, which is why this notion, frankly, that by saying to seniors you can't stay in Medicare now, you've got to go into the private insurance market, has been disproven by our experience most recently.

□ 2110

So we said we're not going to overpay them. And you know what? We used some of those savings to close the prescription drug doughnut hole that seniors fall in. We used some of those savings.

Now, it's important to understand that the Republican budget, even though there was a lot of demagoguery about that, you kept those savings, but what you didn't do is continue to close the doughnut hole. Immediately upon passage of the Republican budget, that doughnut hole will stop closing for seniors.

I want to pick up on a point Mr. GARAMENDI made about Medicaid because, as this chart indicates, the great majority of funds for Medicaid go to seniors and individuals with disabilities. Make no mistake, this happens immediately. We're not talking about 10 years from now, 8 years from now. This happens right away.

Now, Medicaid is a program where actually the costs of care have grown much slower than the rest of the health care market, including the private market, and yet it is a program that is stretched very thin. You take $700 billion-plus out of that system, you are going to be putting people at serious risk, already overstretched programs.

So what choice did you make? Well, this is what choice you made with respect to Medicaid.

You cut about $771 billion. Guess what? You returned to the tax rates that were in effect on the top 2 percent income earners during the Clinton administration; over 10 years, $800 billion. Those are the choices you're making. Put all of these individuals at risk—seniors in nursing homes, assisted living facilities, poor kids—so that you can provide that tax break.

I've heard it said on the floor that, oh, boy, if we do that, if we go back to the Clinton-era tax rates, that's going to really hurt the economy. That's going to hurt jobs.

Look at this. Here's the Clinton-era tax rate: 20 million jobs were created during that period of time. Here's the current tax rate, end of the Bush administration: 653,000 jobs lost.

The history tells the story. The reason is because there are lots of factors that go into decisions by businesses how to invest. And while, obviously, tax rates are a part of it, they are not the major driver in the economy.

I've heard it said that this is going to hurt small businesses. I hope one thing that we can agree on is that small businesses are the engine of our economy. They're what make this economy go.

And so we always hear from our Republican colleagues, well, you go back to the Clinton era rates for the top, you're going to hurt small businesses. Well, I hope everybody will look at the Joint Committee on Taxation. What they say is that there are only 3 percent of small businesses who fall into that higher income category, because we're talking about taxable income. Only 3 percent of small businesses fall into those rates.

Now, we hear from our Republican colleagues, oh, that's true it's only 3 percent, but it's 50 percent. Well, here. Fifty percent of the income comes from those 3 percent. Why do you think that is? Well, look at the same Joint Committee on Taxation report. Many such businesses are hardly ''small.''

In 2005, over 12,000 S corporations and over 6,000 partnerships grossed more than $50 million. There's your mom-and-pop store. There's your mom-and-pop store working hard as a small business trying to make ends meet. Those are what Republicans are calling small businesses.

I'm going to give you some examples of those small businesses. And there are lots of them, but just to give people an idea of the Republican definition of small businesses: major Wall Street investment house KKR; one of the big four accounting firms, Pricewaterhouse—these are S corporations—Fortune 100; Pipeline Company; Enterprise GP Holdings; Washington law firms.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Washington law firms.

I want to point out, these firms are doing good work. There is nothing wrong with what these firms are doing. But don't tell the American people that these are small businesses. Over $50 million a year. They can help do their share to get our deficit under control.

Go back to the Clinton administration rates. Let's have a balanced approach. Yes, we need to do cuts. We understand that. But as the bipartisan fiscal commission said, you've got to do revenues, too, and if you don't, here's what happened:

President Bush inherited a $5.6 trillion surplus from the Clinton administration, and where did it go? When President Obama was sworn in, the day he put his hand on the Bible, he faced a deficit in that year of over $1.3 trillion and a 10-year deficit of over $10 trillion.

Let's have a balanced approach. Let's have shared sacrifice. Let's be serious about getting our deficits under control.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Yielding myself 30 seconds, I can't help but think many Democrats are eager for everyone else to sacrifice. What about government? Why can't government sacrifice a little? All of those obsolete agencies and all of those wasteful programs, the money they spit away on stimulus programs and to bail out anyone who needs it. Maybe it is time for shared sacrifice, and it can start with the big, fat, bloated Federal Government.

At this time, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to a physician who has delivered more than 3,000 babies in his life, is a valued member of the Joint Economic Committee, and expert on health care and many of our health care entitlements, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for the recognition, and it is an important debate that we're having tonight. Madam Chairwoman, I hope that people are watching the debate because this really does set the tone, set the course, set the compass for the future of our country. And this is a debate that really should not be partisan, although we certainly have heard some partisan references. I may even make one or two myself.

But right now intergenerational expectations are down. And in that murky environment, we now have PAUL RYAN come forward and bringing us a fact-based budget that provides a pathway for America's future. Everyone knows the rising cost of health care is a serious threat—not just to our Federal Government but to our prosperity in general. Unfortunately, the President last year, and the Democratic majority that was present in Congress last year, made the problem worse.

Here's the simple truth. Instead of reforming Medicaid and Medicare and using the savings for deficit reduction, the Democrats spent every penny of savings, every single penny of savings and then a lot more on a new entitlement program. Incredibly, they accelerated the crisis, and Medicare and Medicaid are even more in peril today than they were before this all started in 2009. They found a fire, and they put it out with gasoline, and is it a surprise that it's worse?

In contrast, the budget that we're debating tonight, the Ryan budget, saves Medicare and Medicaid for future generations and uses reforms to make the programs financially sustainable.

Now, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Democratic plan that we know as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act would increase spending by almost $1½ trillion, primarily by expanding Medicaid and creating new subsidies to buy health insurance. The so-called Affordable Care Act would increase coverage for the insured and uninsured, provide coverage for the uninsured, but that also is going to create greater demand for health care. But at the same time we put in constraints. We limit physician education and training. We limit testing and patents for drugs and devices. We restrict the very supply of health care. And, consequently, much of the increased demand will in fact deliver us higher prices, not more services.

The Congressional Budget Office and chief actuary at the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services who scored the legislation readily admit that they did not include the price effects of the increased demand for services.

□ 2120

In fact, the chief actuary at the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, his report wasn't even released until 3½ weeks after you passed the bill a little over a year ago and signed it into law. Thus, the official budget estimates understate the true cost of the amount of spending that was contained within this health care law.

Secondly, the available budget estimates ignore the negative impact of higher taxes on economic growth. An almost 4 percent surtax on interest, dividends, and capital gains for those earning over $250,000 a year will reduce business investment and employment. Thus, the new tax will reduce economic growth and generate less revenue than expected. This problem cannot be fixed by simply raising taxes on the American people.

Thirdly, the budget estimates assume a 29 percent across the board reduction in Medicare physician payments in 2012 and beyond, as well as continual reductions in other Medicare provider payments, but both the CBO and the Medicare actuary have called the reductions unrealistic. In fact, Chief Actuary Foster said if you believe this, then I have got good news for you about the future of Medicare. But we all know that the reality does not match the expectations.

Then here is the other problem, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. And I have got a great deal of sympathy with my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. When you passed the Affordable Care Act the first time, you did not include the Independent Payment Advisory Board because you saw through that. You saw that as a trick, a trap. Yet when you got the bill from the Senate that you in turn felt you had to pass, it contained the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

What does the Independent Payment Advisory Board do? Well, it gets 15 people, goodness knows who they are, goodness knows who selects them, and they are going to deliver to Congress a menu of cuts. We either get to vote them up or down. Sure enough, we get to participate in that. But if we vote them down, we have got to come forward with an identical dollar figure on cuts. And if we are unable to do that, and when has that ever happened in this body, if we are unable do that, the Secretary of Health and Human Services the following April 15, that is tomorrow, gets to implement those cuts anyway.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BURGESS. Then what happened yesterday? The President, in talking about his vision for the budget—by the way, his second vision for the budget this year—doubled down on the Independent Payment Advisory Board and said it's such a good idea we're going to do even more.

You know Elias Zerhouni, the former head of the National Institutes of Health, talked about a day medicine is going to become much more personalized, personalized, predictive, therefore more preventive and requiring more participation by patients. Wouldn't it be great, following Chairman RYAN's vision, that we personalized Medicare to match that personalized medicine that our children and our grandchildren are going to enjoy in the future?

Instead, we are going to end up with more of the same, which is a benevolent, albeit benevolent central planner, moving those data points around on a spreadsheet. Why not put the power back in the hands of the American people? That's what the Ryan budget plan does. We ought to support his effort and be grateful for its presence.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chair, can you tell us how much time we have left on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, one of the great companies in this Nation, and a big company in Vermont, is International Business Machines. This year they are about to celebrate their 100th anniversary. I was speaking to some folks from IBM in my office a few days ago, and they told me the story of what happened to them in 1992.

The world was turning upside down in the tech industry. Companies that wanted to survive had to make big decisions. They had 400,000 employees, and there was some question as to whether they were going to make payroll. They had to make changes. They did two things. They looked at every single element of their operation. They looked at every single line item in their spending. In every single place they could make a cut, tough as it was, they did. They made cuts. But they also said where do we have to be in 10 years, and what do we have to do to get there?

As nerve-wracking as it was for those folks at IBM, they made decisions to invest money in acquisitions, in research and development, to meet a plan that required investment, that required spending at a time when they were doing every single thing they could to save every single nickel.

Now IBM is stronger than ever, and it's going to celebrate its 100th anniversary. This country has to make similar decisions. We have to cut. There is not an argument here. I listened to PAUL RYAN when he gave his opening statement, and he said we have to leave this country and its fiscal state better off for our kids and grandkids. He is right. There is no question about it. That means like companies that look at a balance sheet, we have to look every single place we can to save money.

The criticism about many governmental programs you know is right, we know is right. Wherever we can find that waste, fraud, or abuse, let's get rid of it. That serves nobody, Republican or Democrat. But on the other hand, we have to make investments. There are places we in fact do have to spend money. And we have seen that in the history of our country. So judgments have to be made.

My question about the Republican budget is basically the premise in the budget. It's not the goal. Mr. RYAN stated that well. He speaks for me when he says about that obligation to leave our kids better off. But there are two premises in the budget as I see it. One is that lower taxes are always better and will lead to growth. Sometimes that's true, but not always. We have to have revenues to pay for infrastructure, to pay for things like broadband deployment, to pay for the National Institute of Science, things that we might argue about where is the best priority, but we need revenues to do things like a company needs revenues to make investments.

The second premise is that less spending is always better than more investment. Those, as I see it, are the two premises that are in the Ryan budget. And those are debatable.

Now, the other aspect of the budget that in my view, Madam Chair, is lacking is what's off the table. It's not what's on the table. I don't agree with the Medicare proposal in the Ryan budget. But it's fair to put Medicare on the table for debate. We've got to make that more affordable.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. What is the problem is that the Pentagon is off the table, the war in Iraq and Afghanistan are still on the credit card and off the table. Whatever our positions are on some of these matters, including military, we will all stand up, we have to pay our way.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to speak directly to the senior citizens of America and to those who want to become senior citizens. The Republican budget destroys, terminates Medicare as we know it today. Under the Republican budget, in 10 years Medicare will no longer exist as it is today, a guaranteed benefit available to every American who turns 65. It will be over. Instead, you will be given a voucher, a voucher that will be insufficient to pay for your health insurance, and there is no guarantee what that health insurance will be.

Let me speak also to those who are on Medicare today. The Republican budget over the next 10 years removes three-quarters of a trillion dollars, $771 billion, from Medicaid. Medicaid provides services to the aged, blind, and disabled. Those senior citizens that are in nursing homes stand the risk of being thrown out of the nursing homes.

I want to now speak to those who want to become 65, who want to live long enough to get into Medicare. If you are 55 years of age and younger, you will not have Medicare if the Republican budget becomes law. It is over. It is terminated. It is gone. Instead, you will be given a voucher to go talk to the insurance companies. And what will you talk about? You will talk about pain, pain, pain.

They say that there is no tax shift in this. In fact, there is a $6,000 tax equivalent to every person 55 and younger.

You are going to wind up paying an additional $6,000.

□ 2130

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would remind our listeners that it was our Democrats who fought the prescription drug program that has been so critical for seniors to buy their medicine. They slashed half a trillion dollars from Medicare to pay for the new ObamaCare plan, and they did nothing to preserve Medicaid for our seniors.

The exaggerations today that are flying through this Chamber really are shameful. What the Republicans are intent on doing is preserving Medicare for every generation. We are not going to bury our heads in the sand.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

The Democrats have failed to lead on these important entitlement programs. They had their chance. They failed. The Republicans will lead, and we will preserve those programs.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chair, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The circumstance that we are dealing with is to continue the progress that we have made. We have provided health care for people through Medicare and Medicaid.

The opposition here in this district wants to eliminate that. They want to cut back on Medicare and make it more difficult and more expensive.

We have expanded the opportunity for people to get jobs. They want to eliminate that. We have tried to make this whole system more equitable, more fair, and more genuine. They are trying to provide more funding for the wealthiest people and less for the working people and fewer opportunities for the working people.

For all of those reasons, we oppose this legislation, and we hope that most of the population of this district will oppose it as well.

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

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, how many Americans really think this country is heading in the right direction? How many Americans, middle class Americans, believe that these deficits, trillion-dollar deficits, can go on and on as far as the eye can see? Although Americans believe that they have better lives and opportunities than their parents, how many of them question whether their children will have the same opportunities in America today?

You know, we can't continue to go down this path, and that's what the Ryan Republican budget is all about, a new direction for America where we no longer hide our heads in the sand and ignore the problems facing America.

PAUL RYAN and the Republican budget tell the truth to the American public about how serious a problem we face as a Nation. It offers real commonsense solutions to address them. It gives them ideas that work, solutions that work. It creates economic growth and job creation by fostering the right business climate for growth in America.

It tackles our spending, dangerous spending deficits, by reducing those over time, implying and imposing discipline on our Federal Government. So they have to live within the same means our families and small businesses have to. It provides real security for our seniors and Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security.

More importantly, it offers hope for young people who don't think those programs will ever be around again. PAUL RYAN and the Republican budget offer some hope that they don't have today, and it repeals this terrible ObamaCare and gives America hope again.

I strongly support this budget.

Mr. COOPER. Madam Chair, I believe that America should solve its biggest problems in a bipartisan fashion. It takes Democrats, Republicans and Independents working together to find the best solutions. This is particularly true of budgets, which determine so much of the future of our great Nation. Unfortunately, budget season is one of the most partisan times in Congress, despite the fact that the public has been demanding that we stop the bickering.

I have been working hard to offer this House the chance to vote on a budget that is modeled on the President's Fiscal Commission, known as the Bowles-Simpson Report. I support this approach to budgeting because it is, so far at least, the only serious, bipartisan plan for reducing our runaway federal budget deficits. The Bowles-Simpson Commission received the support of Commission members as diverse as the liberal Democratic Senator DICK DURBIN and the conservative Republican Senator TOM COBURN. The Commission received such widespread support because it did three things:

Cut the deficit by $4 trillion over the next ten years;

Shared the sacrifice: put every federal program on the table; and

Provided a balanced approach: 2/3 spending cuts and 1/3 tax reform.

While there are many other important features of the Bowles-Simpson Report, it is important to understand that budget resolutions never include detailed recommendations of any reform plan. Budget resolutions only include a broad framework and mandate that the committees of jurisdiction figure out ways to achieve the necessary savings and reform. That's why the Cooper Substitute makes House committees reduce the deficit by as much as Bowles-Simpson recommends, but does not tell them exactly how to do it.

I am proud to have the full support and vote of my Republican colleague, the gentleman from Virginia FRANK WOLF, who worked with me to pass the Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission Act to form a Fiscal Commission last Congress. The SAFE Act became the model for the Bowles-Simpson Commission. FRANK WOLF has worked harder than any member I know to get the leadership of both parties, in both houses, and the White House, to take our budget deficit problems seriously and to act promptly in order to reduce their burden on future generations. FRANK WOLF is a true leader, and he is, in my opinion, a genuine American hero on fiscal responsibility.

I appreciate the Rules Committee making the Cooper Substitute in order. I hope that this return to more open debates in the House becomes the norm so that the best ideas, not just the most partisan ideas, can reach the House floor. Chairman DREIER has already taken important steps in this regard so that the House can once again work its will, regardless of politics or party.

Madam Chair, I had hoped to offer my Substitute tonight, even though the hour is late, not believing that it ever had a ghost of a chance of passage, but believing that the votes deserved to be counted on this important proposal. The timing is not right, however, for several unforeseeable reasons.

Yesterday, the President made an important speech on the budget that, temporarily at least, has inflamed partisan passions on both sides of the aisle, making a vote tomorrow less likely to be a reasoned one. I think the President should be complimented for moving the debate in a positive direction, regardless of the spin that each side has given it. For example, if the President had called for $4 trillion of deficit reduction as recently as two months ago, he would have been denounced by many people. Yesterday, he was more favorably received. I give Republicans, particularly my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin and Chairman of the Budget Committee PAUL RYAN, credit for having moved the debate so far. Mr. RYAN, just like the President, has been unfairly vilified, which does nothing to reduce the debt burden on future generations. Finger-pointing does not solve problems.

Another crucial development is the sensitive nature of the quiet Senate negotiations on deficit reduction, particularly the so-called Gang of Six. We all realize that, because the other body is less partisan than today's House, a comprehensive solution is more likely to originate in that chamber. The fact that Senators ranging from DURBIN to COBURN have already supported Bowles-Simpson is proof. I do not think it is wise to risk doing anything to derail or impair those behind-the-scenes negotiations, which I am told by key senators in both parties could be the result of a premature House vote.

The day will come, probably with the necessary debt ceiling increase this summer, for a comprehensive, bipartisan solution to our deficit problem. For that to happen, the partisan passions of this budget debate must burn out. Members must go back home and brag about their favorite budget before they get realistic and agree on a spending plan that can actually pass the House and Senate and be signed into law by the President. Every day we wait to solve these problems costs us dearly; by some estimates, as much as $8 billion a day. I wish that this cycle of additional politics were not necessary—and I have done everything I can to avoid it—but there are no shortcuts in a democracy.

The time spent on the Cooper Substitute has not been wasted. Countless members in both parties have learned the contents of the Bowles-Simpson Report because they thought they might have to vote for a budget that embodies spending cuts of such size and tax reforms of such nature that it would actually make a difference. Nothing so concentrates the mind as the fear of voting. Numerous members of both parties have told me that they intended to support Bowles-Simpson either on a stand-alone basis or in addition to supporting another budget of their choice. I appreciate the interest and genuine goodwill that so many members have shown in asking questions, comparing alternatives, and making the tough decisions that are required by budgeting. I think that the work that I, and my allies like FRANK WOLF, have done is important for laying the groundwork for an eventual bipartisan budget that will be required, no later than this summer, in order to start solving our Nation's deficit problems.

Madam Chair, this Congress must act very soon indeed to start solving our Nation's fiscal problems. I wish today were that day. I voted today for $38 billion in cuts to appropriations for the remaining few months of this year, but that is only a tiny beginning and only affects 12% of our federal budget. Serious reform means getting the House to pass something as large, as important, and as bipartisan as Bowles-Simpson-sized reforms. Bowles-Simpson is not the only solution for our problems, but it is the fastest, fairest, and most feasible solution that we know of today. As soon as this House is able to consider it calmly and sensibly, the House must do so.

COOPER BUDGET SUBSTITUTE

The Cooper Budget Substitute takes the benchmarks set by the President's bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and puts them into a budget resolution framework. It would reduce the deficit by $4 trillion over the next 10 years with 2/3 spending cuts and 1/3 tax reform. The Commission proposed a series of specific recommendations for achieving these benchmarks, but these are not included in the Cooper Substitute. Instead, like all budgets, this resolution provides a blueprint for committees of jurisdiction to determine how spending cuts of this size should be made.

The Cooper Substitute embodies the only bipartisan approach for getting America back on track. The U.S. federal budget is on an unsustainable path. For years, members have talked about fiscal responsibility. It's time for those who claim to be fiscally responsible to walk the walk, not just talk the talk.

OVERVIEW

	2021 Deficit as % GDP	2021 Debt as % GDP
Ryan	−1.6%	67.5%
Cooper	−1.6%	69.4%

Details of the Cooper Budget Substitute are as follows:

Shared sacrifice: everything is on the table

Big enough to matter: Cuts the deficit by over $4 trillion over the next 10 years

Balanced approach: Achieves deficit reduction with 2/3 spending cuts, 1/3 tax reform

Fast enough to matter: Reaches primary balance in 2015

Reduces the size of government: Returns to 2008 spending levels by 2013

Caps revenue at 21% of GDP; gets spending below 22% and on a path to 21% of GDP

Bipartisan cooperation to ensure 75-year solvency of Social Security

Tax reform:

Reduces tax rates for individuals, small businesses, and corporations

Reduces the $1.1 trillion in annual tax expenditures and tax give-aways

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's "Road to Ruin" Budget Resolution for a variety of reasons, including because it will destroy hundreds of thousands of American transportation jobs—jobs lost in every state—and will severely jeopardize our Nation's economic competitiveness.

This Budget slashes investments in our people—from ending Medicare as we know it to destroying the family-wage jobs of highway construction—all the while, providing a double-digit percentage tax break for millionaires that most of them will not even notice. It makes Big Oil smile from ear to ear knowing that they can exploit $40 billion in tax loopholes, yet the Budget completely neglects millions of American potholes.

As the Ranking Member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and given that Congress faces major surface transportation reauthorization legislation this year, let me focus for a moment on what this Budget does to highway and transit infrastructure investment.

Consider this for a moment. Today, China spends nine percent of its GDP per year on infrastructure. India spends five percent of its GDP per year on infrastructure. Yet, the United States of America only spends 1.9 percent of its GDP per year on infrastructure. Woefully inadequate as it stands.

Yet, the Republican Budget cuts highway, highway safety, and transit investment by about one-third: one-third less bridge repair, one-third less safety improvement, and one-third less bus service is where this Budget leads us—destroying family-wage highway and transit construction jobs all along the way. And placing us in an even less competitive position than we already are against countries like China and India. Incredible. Simply incredible.

Over the next six years, the current budget baseline investment level for highway, highway safety, and public transit investments is $331 billion, including $316 billion of contract authority from the Highway Trust Fund and $15 billion from the General Fund.

Based on the assumptions included in the Republican Budget, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Republican Budget provides only $219 billion of Highway Trust Fund funding over the next six years. In effect, the Republican Budget slashes surface transportation investment by more than $100 billion over the next six years.

Let me repeat that, because I want my colleagues to be very aware of what this budget proposes to do in this area. Today is the 100th day that the Republicans have been in control of the House and today they are proposing to cut more than $100 billion from investments in America's future. Investments that keep our economy moving and help to ensure that America remains a good place to do business. One hundred days in control of the House and they want to slash $100 billion from transportation investments. They haven't brought a single jobs bill to the Floor of this House, and yet, today, to mark their 100th day anniversary, here we are debating a Budget that will destroy half a million highway jobs. Amazing.

According to a CBO analysis of the Republican Budget assumptions, this Budget will slash current year highway funding from $41.1 billion to approximately $27 billion in fiscal year 2012. A 34 percent cut in year one of the reauthorization bill will destroy more than 490,000 jobs over the coming years. West Virginia cannot afford a $143 million cut in highway investment next year. This investment and its 5,000 good-paying jobs are critical to our mountain economy and ensuring that rural America shares in the great opportunities provided by our country. Put simply, middle class Americans cannot afford the Republican "Road to Ruin" budget.

Finally, the Republican Budget destroys any pretext that Republicans will restore the highway and transit budget firewalls that they wiped away on the first day of their new majority in the 112th Congress. When Congress enacted those firewalls in 1998 to restore the trust to the Highway Trust Fund and keep faith with the traveling public, I stood shoulder-to-shoulder with former Republican Committee Chairman Bud Shuster. We lost that battle on the Budget at 3:00 a.m. in May 1997, but, one year later, won the war with enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century establishing the budget firewalls, which have served the traveling public for the past 14 years. As their very first act in the majority, Republicans broke the "trust" of the Highway Trust Fund.

There was a time when Republicans were proud of their heritage in leading the way on infrastructure investment. They were the party of Lincoln and Eisenhower.

To my good friends across the aisle, do not let infrastructure investment become a mere footnote in the legacy of your party.

Join with me and let us rebuild America.

Let us provide the building blocks to ensure that every community and all of our people have an opportunity to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and defeat H. Con. Res. 34, the Republican Budget Resolution.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION STASHES FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

[FY 2012 Highway Cuts Destroy More than 490,000 Jobs, April 15, 2011]

State	FY 2011 Estimated (P.L. 112–5 & H.R. 1473)	FY 2012 Republican Budget Res. (H. Con. Res. 34)	FY 2011 Estimated & Republican Budget Res. Difference	Jobs Lost under Republican Budget Resolution (FY 2012 Cuts Only)
Alabama	$723,817,235	462,250,406	−,566,829	−9,097
Alaska	428,269,900	285,374,201	−142,895,699	−4,970
Arizona	693,234,143	447,806,436	−245,427,707	−8,536
Arkansas	482,477,889	308,255,243	−174,222,646	−6,059
California	3,431,126,457	2,171,036,650	−1,260,089,807	−43,825

REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION STASHES FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT—Continued

[FY 2012 Highway Cuts Destroy More than 490,000 Jobs, April 15, 2011]

State	FY 2011 Estimated (P.L. 112–5 & H.R. 1473)	FY 2012 Republican Budget Res. (H. Con. Res. 34)	FY 2011 Estimated & Republican Budget Res. Difference	Jobs Lost under Republican Budget Resolution (FY 2012 Cuts Only)
Colorado	510,719,211	322,886,021	−187,833,190	−6,533
Connecticut	471,433,185	301,400,538	−170,032,647	−5,914
Delaware	158,128,144	99 887,076	−58,241,068	−2,026
District of Columbia	153,577,571	95,065,701	−58,511,870	−2,035
Florida	1,789,644,393	1,165,594,138	−624,050,255	−21,704
Georgia	1,220,785,141	791,842,153	−428,942,988	−14,918
Hawaii	162,407,438	101,173,351	−61,234,087	−2,130
Idaho	271,135,551	174,914,534	−96,221,017	−3,346
Illinois	1,351,823,020	863,482,496	−488,340,524	−16,984
Indiana	901,039,828	585,100,712	−315,939,116	−10,988
Iowa	457,309,004	287,486,787	−169,822,217	−5,906
Kansas	363,077,071	225,819,716	−137,257,355	−4,774
Kentucky	632,175,735	404,926,310	−227,249,425	−7,904
Louisiana	647,903,984	410,682,482	−237,221,502	−8,250
Maine	178,205,952	109,980,962	−68,224,990	−2,373
Maryland	573,449,606	361,042,525	−212,407,081	−7,387
Massachusetts	583,187,497	363,290,346	−219,897,151	−7,648
Michigan	1,003,912,719	637,456,986	−366,455,733	−12,745
Minnesota	600,731,686	382,954,688	−217,776,998	−7,574
Mississippi	452,174,362	286,047,250	−166,127,112	−5,778
Missouri	858,241,416	549,923,220	−308,318,196	−10,723
Montana	364,842,726	236,468,527	−128,374,199	−4,465
Nebraska	276,860,675	173,666,205	−103,194,470	−3,589
Nevada	345,191,710	221,019,688	−124,172,022	−4,319
New Hampshire	157,856,187	99,692,079	−58,164,108	−2,023
New Jersey	945,386,072	603,896,272	−341,489,800	−11,877
New Mexico	341,222,251	217,735,976	−123,486,275	−4,295
New York	1,606,218,296	1,010,339,801	−595,878,495	−20,724
North Carolina	987,134,805	634,033,049	−353,101,756	−12,281
North Dakota	237,776,846	149,197,373	−88,579,473	−3,081
Ohio	1,250,956,575	800,549,144	−450,407,431	−15,665
Oklahoma	605,192,291	383,540,118	−221,652,173	−7,709
Oregon	468,329,024	294,096,576	−174,232,448	−6,060
Pennsylvania	1,568,798,108	991,784,840	−577,013,268	−20,068
Rhode Island	207,603,230	128,123,683	−79,479,547	−2,764
South Carolina	595,668,018	383,573,586	−212,094,432	−7,376
South Dakota	262,505,740	167,067,361	−95,438,379	−3,319
Tennessee	785,406,105	504,632,610	−280,773,495	−9,765
Texas	2,987,661,091	1,933,957,611	−1,053,703,480	−36,647
Utah	307,014,758	195,286,348	−111,728,410	−3,886
Vermont	191,887,512	118,612,958	−73,274,554	−2,548
Virginia	948,805,255	608,667,388	−340,137,867	−11,830
Washington	634,850,084	395,948,876	−238,901,208	−8,309
West Virginia	407,534,178	264,177,667	−143,356,511	−4,986
Wisconsin	686,452,037	445,591,025	−240,861,012	−8,377
Wyoming	232,719,377	147,196,966	−85,522,411	−2,974
Federal Lands and Other Allocated Programs	$4,603,138,911	$3,695,463,345	−$907,675,566	−31,568
Total	$41,107,000,00	$27,000,000,000	−14,107,000,000	−490,627

Note: This table was prepared by Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Democratic Staff based on technical assistance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The FY 2011 Estimated column represents the state-by-state distribution of the Federal-aid Highway obligation limitation assuming enactment of H.R. 1473. Based on the Highway Trust Fund parameters included in H. Con. Res. 34, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the FY 2012 Federal-aid Highway obligation limitation would be $27 billion. The FY 2012 Republican Budget Resolution column reflects the state-by-state distribution of these funds under current FHWA apportionment factors. The Jobs Lost column is based on the 2007 FHWA model on the correlation between highway infrastructure investment and employment: $1 billion of Federal-aid Highway investment creates or sustains 34,779 jobs over a seven-year period.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the budget agreement for the rest of fiscal year 2011. This bill, which contains nearly $40 billion in spending cuts, brings a much-needed conclusion to this year's budget debate.

While I have concerns about some of the cuts in this bill—particularly to the Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Aviation Administration—doing nothing is simply not an option. The American people expect us to cut spending and reduce the deficit, and this agreement represents a compromise that moves us forward.

As we take up next year's budget and raising the debt limit, it is my hope that we will do so carefully without undermining our nation's economic recovery. And, as President Obama noted yesterday during his budget address, there must be shared sacrifice. Upper income Americans, corporations and the Department of Defense must be part of the process of cutting spending and increasing revenues, while we ensure that our social safety net remains intact. Programs for our seniors and the poor must not be singled out during this debate.

Madam Chair, we can find budget savings across all departments of the government while still making strategic investments and protecting the safety and security of the American people, and I look forward to continuing this work.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, the Republican budget for FY 2012 continues the reckless Republican fiscal policy. It takes a slash and burn approach to the budget, rather than going line by line to see where we can afford to cut and where we cannot. This is a budget that favors Big Oil over the middle class, asks for sacrifice from seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract in our America.

The budget would open an enormous hole in our country's social safety net by turning Medicare into a voucher program. These fixed-value vouchers do not account for the yearly increases in health care costs and will increase seniors' annual out-of-pocket expenses by nearly $7,000. Their budget would decimate our primary assistance to the poor by turning Medicaid into a block grant. This is the Republican vision: to balance the budget on the backs of the seniors and the poor.

Madam Chair, Democrats have a better way. We understand that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach that protects our fragile recovery. Our plan would take on our deficits in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong: education, health care, innovation, and clean energy. Democrats will balance the budget without reneging on the bedrock promise of Social Security and Medicare.

Madam Chair, this Republican budget moves us backwards. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it and taking a more sensible approach.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 112–62 is considered as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

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

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: $1,866,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,127,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,324,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,425,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,522,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,693,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,807,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,958,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,119,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,286,942,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: -$25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: -$227,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$346,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$406,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$448,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$482,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$544,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$561,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$597,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $2,858,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,835,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,905,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,970,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,114,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,224,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,330,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,490,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,639,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,767,274,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $2,947,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,915,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,902,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,949,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,097,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,193,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,271,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,450,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,587,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,726,564,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $1,081,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $787,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $578,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $523,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $574,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $499,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $463,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $492,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $467,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $439,622,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $16,204,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,951,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,697,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,503,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,245,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,968,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,699,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,408,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,102,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $11,418,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,797,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,319,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,876,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,351,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,787,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,242,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,673,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $16,068,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $582,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $600,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $616,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $628,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $641,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $653,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $665,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $677,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $666,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $690,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $702,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $691,494,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $30,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $31,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,740,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $27,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $27,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $27,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,946,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $6,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,010,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,211,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,992,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $19,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $18,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $17,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $17,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $16,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,873,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $14,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$13,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,650,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $64,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $64,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $64,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $60,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $65,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $70,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $66,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $67,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,853,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $11,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $12,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $12,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $67,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $63,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $69,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $73,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $75,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $76,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $78,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $79,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $80,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,047,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $341,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $346,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $343,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $338,064,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $327,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $320,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $339,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $349,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $371,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $395,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $382,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $404,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,682,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $481,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $481,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $519,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $520,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $550,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $550,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $573,252,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $618,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $619,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $637,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $657,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $657,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $711,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $711,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $758,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $758,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $809,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $809,201,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $501,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $487,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $457,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $456,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $431,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $436,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $436,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $434,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $441,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $434,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $457,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $454,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $468,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $465,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $480,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $477,942,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $58,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,053,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $130,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $134,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $138,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $147,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $146,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $145,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $155,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $159,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $164,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,622,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $56,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $45,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $45,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $44,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $45,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $47,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $50,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,407,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,024,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $372,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $435,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $508,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $508,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $578,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $648,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $648,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $712,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $712,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $769,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $769,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $818,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $864,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $864,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $899,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $899,690,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$10,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$11,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$16,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$16,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$22,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$27,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$27,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$33,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$32,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$38,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$38,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$43,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$43,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$49,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$48,947,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$81,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$81,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$82,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$97,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$97,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$110,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$110,174,000,000.
(21) Global War on Terrorism and related activities (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,929,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,769,000,000.

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

SEC. 201. POLICY STATEMENT ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

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

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 19 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 19 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 19 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 20.75 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 18.75 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 14.75 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate amounts of deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: -1.75 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 0.25 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 4.25 percent.

(4) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 64 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 48 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 10 percent.

TITLE III—RESERVES AND CONTINGENCIES

SEC. 301. COSTS OF THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the global war on terrorism and other activities and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations and the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 401 may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2012 and the new outlays resulting therefrom.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 3(c) of House Resolution 5 (112th Congress) shall have force and effect through May 31, 2011.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure does not increase the deficit in the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFICIT-NEUTRAL REVENUE MEASURES.

If any bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, decreases revenue, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution, if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) or make changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565), or both, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or direct spending over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2012 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2012 through 2016, or for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Spending limits for total discretionary Federal spending are—
fiscal year 2012—
(1) new budget authority, $1,019,402,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,170,384,000,000;
fiscal year 2013—
(1) new budget authority, $1,027,896,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,113,298,000,000;
fiscal year 2014—
(1) new budget authority, $1,038,537,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,094,740,000,000;
fiscal year 2015—
(1) new budget authority, $1,046,680,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,089,081,000,000;
fiscal year 2016—
(1) new budget authority, $1,055,779,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,093,043,000,000;
fiscal year 2017—
(1) new budget authority, $1,067,794,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,098,357,000,000;
fiscal year 2018—
(1) new budget authority, $1,085,259,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,105,668,000,000;
fiscal year 2019—
(1) new budget authority, $1,103,802,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,126,521,000,000;
fiscal year 2020—
(1) new budget authority, $1,122,611,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,145,102,000,000; and
fiscal year 2021—
(1) new budget authority, $1,141,640,000,000; and
(2) outlays, $1,167,939,000,000.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that causes discretionary budget authority to exceed any level set forth in subsection (a).

SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2013, the aggregate amount of advance appropriation shall not exceed—
(1) $52,541,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—
(A) Medical Services;
(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and
(C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and
(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all other programs.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the list referred to in subsection (b) or the amount set forth in subsection (c)(2) to accommodate the enactment of general or continuing appropriation Acts for fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 403. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

SEC. 404. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS FOR LEGISLATION.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—For purposes of enforcing this resolution, the revenue levels shall be those set forth in the March 2011 Congressional Budget Office baseline. The total amount of adjustments made under subsection (b) may not cause revenue levels to be below the levels set forth in paragraph (1)(A) of section 101 for fiscal year 2012 and the period comprising fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.— (1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution for—
(A) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001;
(B) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003;
(C) the budgetary effects of measures that adjust the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption amounts to prevent a larger number of taxpayers as compared with tax year 2008 from being subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax or of allowing the use of nonrefundable personal credits against the Alternative Minimum Tax, or both as applicable;
(D) the budgetary effects of extending the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010;
(E) the budgetary effects of measures providing a 20 percent deduction in income to small businesses;
(F) the budgetary effects of measures implementing trade agreements;
(G) the budgetary effects of measures repealing the tax increases set forth in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010;

(H) the budgetary effects of measures reforming the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(I) the budgetary effects of measures reforming the tax code and lowering tax rates.

(2) A measure does not qualify for adjustments under paragraph (1)(H) if it—

(A) increases the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021; or

(B) increases revenues over the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021, other than by—

(i) repealing or modifying the individual mandate (codified as section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

(ii) modifying the subsidies to purchase health insurance (codified as section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(c) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—If a committee other than the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chairman 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 2012 and the applicable discretionary spending limits by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and the outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

SEC. 405. 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 mandatory spending in excess of $5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—(1) The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the first four consecutive 10-fiscal-year periods beginning with the first fiscal year following the last fiscal year for which the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget sets forth appropriate budgetary levels.

(2) In this paragraph, the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget is the one most recently adopted before the date on which a committee first reported the bill or joint resolution described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 406. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

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

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying 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.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2012 and the period comprising fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

SEC. 407. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

(d) EXEMPTIONS.—Any legislation for which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution on the budget and complies with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 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 405.

SEC. 408. FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.

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

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman 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. 409. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The following provisions of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) shall no longer have force or effect:

(1) Section 3(e) relating to advance appropriations.

(2) Section 3(f) relating to the treatment of off-budget administrative expenses.

(3) Section 3(g) relating to a long-term spending point of order.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

(1) More than 46 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

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

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2020 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy. Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 7.2 percent per year, and under CBO's alternative fiscal scenario, mandatory spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2080.

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

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

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

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

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

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

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

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

(1) More than 50 million retirees and individuals with a disability depend on Social Security for a key part of their income. 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 2018, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2037, the combined Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2037, benefits will be cut 22 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The current recession has exacerbated the crisis to Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security has entered into permanent cash deficits.

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

(5) Americans deserve action by their elected officials on Social Security reform. It is critical that the Congress and the administration work together in a bipartisan fashion to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this

spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part fo the safety net.

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

(1)(A) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund in its annual Trustees' Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, not later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year; and

(B) such recommendations provided to the President should be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2)(A) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submits its recommendations, the President shall promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress, including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year; and

(B) the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce such legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred should report such legislation, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in and near retirement;

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

(C) improve fairness for participants; and

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

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

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

(1) The President's fiscal year 2012 budget requests a $13 trillion increase in the debt subject to limit over the period of years covered by the budget.

(2) Under the President's fiscal year 2012 budget, according to the Congressional Budget Office, debt held by the public will rise to 69 percent of gross domestic product in 2011 and will reach 87.4 percent of gross domestic product by 2021.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Reserve, the General Accountability Office, the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, and ten former Chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisors all concluded that debt is growing at unsustainable rates and must be brought under control.

(4) Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated, ''Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.''.

(5) According to the Congressional Budget Office, if entitlements are not reformed, entitlement spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid will exceed the historical average of revenue collections as a share of the economy within forty years.

(6) According to the Congressional Budget Office, under current policies, debt would reach levels that the economy could no longer sustain in 2037 and a fiscal crisis is likely to occur well before that date.

(7) To avoid a fiscal crisis, Congress must enact legislation that makes structural reforms to entitlement programs.

(8) Instead of automatic debt increases (the ''Gephardt rule'' was repealed by the House in House Resolution 5) and automatic spending increases, Congress needs to put limits on spending with automatic reductions if spending limits are not met.

(9) The adoption of a conference report on this concurrent resolution will not cause the automatic passage of an increase in the debt limit by the House of Representatives.

(10) Changes in debt levels assumed in this resolution are contingent upon its proposed spending reductions being achieved.

(11) From 1990 to 2002, there were statutory enforceable limits on discretionary spending.

(12) The budget lacks controls over spending in the short-term and the long-term. Greater transparency and controls, particularly for entitlement spending in the long-term, are needed to provide Congress with tools to tackle this growing threat of a fiscal crisis.

(b) POLICY ON DEBT CONTROLS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that in order to begin to bring debt under control the following statutory spending and debt controls are needed:

(1) Enforceable statutory caps on discretionary spending at levels set forth in this fiscal year 2012 concurrent resolution on the budget for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(2) Any increase in the statutory debt limit be accompanied by the enactment of a budget enforcement mechanism to ensure that if spending reductions are not achieved there would be—

(A) an across-the-board reduction in spending at the end of the year;

(B) a fast-track process or failsafe mechanism to give Congress the ability to expedite consideration of legislation to reduce spending and avoid the automatic across-the-board spending reductions; and

(C) an exemption of Social Security from these enforcement mechanisms, with Social Security solvency ensured as provide in section 502.

(3) Limits on total spending with long-term structural reforms that—

(A) require—

(i) the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office to make long-term budget projections (similar to the time-frames of projections made by the Social Security and Medicare trustees);

(ii) the inclusion of the estimated long-term fiscal impact of the President's budget in the President's annual budget submission;

(iii) in the Congressional Budget Office's re-estimate of the President's budget, an estimate of the long-term impact of the President's budget; and

(iv) in Congressional Budget Office estimates on legislation, an estimate of the long-term impact of legislation that has a significant impact on the long-term budget;

(B) require enactment of enforceable caps on total spending as a share of gross domestic product as set forth in this resolution;

(C) require the review by Congress of Congressional Budget Office projections relative to the statutory caps and enactment of legislation to reduce spending to meet those caps;

(D) require enactment of an enforcement mechanism to ensure that if these spending reductions are not achieved, there would be an across-the-board reduction in spending at the end of the year;

(E) require enactment of a fast-track process or failsafe mechanism to provide Congress with the ability to expedite consideration of legislation to reduce spending and avoid the automatic across-the-board spending reductions; and

(F) exempt Social Security from these enforcement mechanisms, with Social Security solvency ensured as provided in section 501.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON A RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN MUST CONSIDER ALL PROGRAMS, INCLUDING THOSE AT THE PENTAGON AND THE OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCIES.

It is the sense of the House that the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as Admiral Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated; the Government Accountability Office has recently issued a report documenting billions of dollars of waste and duplication at Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, and the Department of Defense has never passed a clean audit; the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force were correct in concluding that all programs, including national security, should be ''on the table'' as part of a deficit reduction plan; and any budget plan serious about reducing the deficit must follow this precept to consider all programs, including national security programs, the largest segment of discretionary spending.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report.

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, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112–62.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: $2,205,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,508,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,802,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,010,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,178,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,338,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,492,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,651,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,828,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,015,043,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $314,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $153,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $131,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $179,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $207,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $163,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $157,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $148,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $147,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $131,460,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $3,140,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,050,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,232,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,401,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,607,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,760,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,897,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,096,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,294,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,459,973,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $3,114,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,109,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,218,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,363,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,573,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,706,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,830,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,043,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,228,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,402,622,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $908,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $600,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $416,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $353,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $395,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $368,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $338,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $392,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $400,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $387,579,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $16,060,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,845,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,548,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,037,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,675,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,305,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,932,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,604,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,301,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,018,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $11,276,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,891,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,315,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,673,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,066,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,435,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,781,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,186,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,615,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $15,043,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $585,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $602,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $618,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $613,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $644,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $656,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $668,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $680,395,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $667,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $692,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $705,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $692,257,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $63,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $59,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,252,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $62,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $63,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,294,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $33,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $33,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $35,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $36,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $36,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $37,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $38,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,944,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $16,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $7,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $7,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $7,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,918,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $38,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $37,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,044,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $42,184,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $40,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,884,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $22,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,494,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $16,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $14,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $14,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $15,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,019,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $164,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $118,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $124,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $131,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $138,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $145,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $142,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $144,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $146,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $148,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,908,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $16,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $17,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $18,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,316,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $127,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $110,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $116,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $120,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $127,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $131,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $133,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $135,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $137,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $138,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,127,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $369,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $384,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $458,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $524,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $572,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $615,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $657,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $654,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $703,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $758,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $744,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $802,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $798,239,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $484,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $520,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $520,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $548,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $570,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $617,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $639,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $661,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $721,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $773,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $773,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $827,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $827,625,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $567,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $534,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $532,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $530,252,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $537,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $538,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $537,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $542,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $557,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $569,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $564,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $581,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,158,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $58,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,053,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $133,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $135,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $139,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $143,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $152,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $151,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $150,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $160,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $164,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $169,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $168,573,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $57,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $62,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $57,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $60,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $60,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $63,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $67,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $69,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,034,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $33,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $45,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,266,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $373,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $429,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $495,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $495,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $556,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $617,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $673,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $673,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $723,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $765,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $765,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $806,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $838,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $838,786,000,000.
(19) Security Allowances (930):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$15,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$21,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$31,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$33,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$35,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$37,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$37,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$38,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$37,728,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$79,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$81,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$81,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$92,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$93,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$93,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$99,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$99,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$104,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$104,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$112,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$112,645,000,000.
(21) Overseas contingency operations (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $64,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $48,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $5,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, the Congressional Black Caucus has offered an alternative resolution to the budget proposals every year since 1981. This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus, and we have over those years served as the conscience of this body.

I stand in front of you today to say that this is perhaps the most important of all of the alternative budgets offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. And the reason is, Madam Chairman, that we believe someone must stand up for the vulnerable population. The vulnerable population is not what we generally like to think; it's not the stereotypical view of a person who doesn't work and is shiftless and is a parasite.

The vulnerable population today consists of firefighters, police officers, municipal workers, State workers, factory workers who have been laid off through no fault of their own because of this weak economy. Those men and women have been struggling trying to make it.

Somebody must stand up for them. They are black, white, brown, they are elderly. Some of them are at an age where it will be difficult for them to get another job. And so somebody must stand up for them, and we have decided that it will be us.

Now, let me just say that these are some weird times. We do have a budget deficit, and we would not at all suggest that we don't need to deal with the budget deficit. What we need to do, however, is deal with it in a way that will protect the vulnerable populations.

Madam Chair, I have a left knee that is artificial, it is a prosthetic, the result of football injuries. And once I recovered and left the hospital after the surgery, my brain automatically forced the rest of my body to pay attention to the sick side of my body. So I automatically, even though I tried not to, did everything I could do to protect my left knee. I even put most of my weight on my right knee.

What I am saying is that our bodies provide us with a message that when some part of our body is vulnerable, is weak, the other part, the strong part, needs to do everything it can to protect the weak part.

The Congressional Black Caucus is saying that our alternative budget does exactly that when you consider the fact that the gap in after-tax income between the richest 1 percent of Americans and the middle and poorest fifths of our country more than doubled between 1979 and 2009.

So we can see that the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer. And when I hear people say we must have shared sacrifice, I disagree.

The poorest people don't need to sacrifice. I am not sure that you can find a single poor person who is responsible for the economic collapse of the last 2 years. Mark Zandi, an economist with unimpeachable Republican credentials, said that 1.7 million people will lose their jobs in the first 2 years if this budget is enacted.

So, Madam Chair, we intend to present our budget now to demonstrate how this body can protect its weak side and still maintain the best of this Republic for the protection of its people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2140

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Chair, I am so glad that we are going through this process this year. I think this is a healthy part of what we do as the United States, what separates us from a lot of other countries. And I'm glad that we are actually doing this. This is my second term in Congress. So last Congress last year, we didn't even go through this process. I think this is healthy.

I think we all care deeply, and we are very patriotic about this country, but I happen to have a vision that says that the proper role of government is somewhat limited and that there is a proper role for government, and that we need to adhere to that proper role.

It's funny, sometimes I hear opposition to the Republican proposal or the Republican budget, and I hear that we're going to sacrifice this and we're going to cut all that. Let's also understand that we're still going to spend $3.5 trillion with a capital T. That's a lot of money. People often ask me, they say how much is $1 trillion? It's kind of a hard number to get your arms around, but if you were to spend $1 million a day, every day, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to $1 trillion, to $1 trillion.

Well, we're $14 trillion in debt. We're paying more than $600 million a day in interest on that debt. It's on its way to $1 billion a day in just the interest on that debt, and we're going to have to deal with the fact that we've got to pay that debt. We've got to cut up the government credit card. We have spent far too much money.

What I like about what we have proposed in the Republican budget is that we start to rein in the out-of-control spending; yet we still fulfill a lot of the obligations that we have to this country, particularly for seniors and others. We will still spend an exorbitant amount of money, but over the course of time, we will be on the proper trajectory to live within our means.

I think that is one of the foundations of this country, the idea of personal responsibility, the idea that we have to live within our means, that we are self-sufficient. And we have to deal with the fact that in Congresses previous, in generations previous, they have racked up this debt. And we go through and blame each other for that. But the reality moving forward is we have to put ourselves on a trajectory to balance the budget and pay off the debt. And that, I think, is one of the great moral responsibilities that we have in the United States Congress, the adult conversation that we have.

There are a lot of needs in this country, but we're broke, ladies and gentlemen. We're broke. And we have got to rein in the spending. And we have got to make the United States as competitive as we can possibly be. Because when we're competitive on the world stage—the United States of America is still the greatest country on the face of the planet—but if we're going to be the military and economic superpower, we have a responsibility to live within our means and to become self-sufficient.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Mr. CLEAVER. I yield myself 10 seconds to just say, when progress is made, someone is always left behind. And my concern is that it's always the vulnerable.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, the Congressional Black Caucus has a long history of submitting fiscally responsible budget alternatives regardless of who may be sitting in the White House or which party holds the majority in Congress.

This year's budget alternative continues this long tradition by putting forth a plan that significantly reduces our deficit over the next decade while increasing economic opportunities and promoting job creation in every corner of our society.

Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget brings the deficit to 1.4 percent of GDP by 2015, better than so-called primary balance, which was the goal of the President's fiscal commission, and achieves primary balance even earlier than the commission, itself. While I commend the Republican chairman of the Budget Committee for proposing a budget that reduces our long-term debt, he only achieves this by shifting medical costs to lower-income Americans and seniors.

The CBC budget is much more responsible. Our budget makes tough choices. But unlike the Republican budget, it doesn't jeopardize Social Security, undermine Medicaid by turning it into a block grant, or shift Medicare costs to seniors by creating a voucher program that doesn't keep pace with medical inflation. Our budget protects these vital programs, and compared to the Republican budget, it has $1.3 trillion more in deficit reduction over the next decade.

The CBC budget proposes responsible revenue increases by closing corporate loopholes and preferences, deterring aggressive stock speculation, which helped contribute to the 2008 financial crisis, and ensuring that the wealthiest Americans who benefited most from the tax cuts and bailouts in the last decades pay their fair share.

Now, with the additional revenues and assuming some of the cuts proposed in the President's budget, the CBC budget uses 80 percent of the additional revenue for deficit reduction, and then invests the rest to protect from making the cuts in our safety net programs, like WIC or Community Health Centers, avoiding cuts in investments in our future like Head Start, Pell Grants, high-speed rail, and NASA, reducing cuts in critical functions like clean water, FBI agents and food inspections, and has more for national defense, homeland security and our veterans. Our budget also fully funds an additional 14 weeks of emergency unemployment benefits for those who have exhausted their benefits, often referred to as the 99ers.

Now, Madam Chair, the CBC budget protects our social safety net. It invests in our future. It maintains essential services in national security. It does all of this and has more deficit reduction than the underlying Republican budget. So we have a choice. We can have lower deficits and a better future, or we can have tax cuts for multimillionaires and oil companies.

I urge my colleagues to make the right choice and support the Cleaver amendment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the freshman gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Chair, the House budget that we're proposing tonight from Republicans is a budget that will take discretionary spending back to the pre-2008 level and begin to deal with our spending issue that we have as a Nation. We have increased our discretionary spending 25 percent over the last 2 years. We're trying to move it back to where we were a few years ago and then allow that to be able to grow with inflation.

We're focusing on freezing in the Federal workforce. It's a recommendation done by the President's own debt commission. And taking that issue on that the President and the debt commission gave to say, how do we need to handle our Federal workforce? It has increased by 140,000 just in a single year. And it begins to walk through the process of what do we do with our social safety net to make sure that the social safety net is still there in the years to come.

We believe there needs to be a social safety net, but as our chairman has said multiple times, that social safety net should be a safety net and not a hammock. And it should allow people to be able to go through that process to find a safe place and a safe harbor for a period of time until they're able to get back on their feet. That's a good thing for us to be able to do as Americans, and we need to find ways to be able to protect that in the days to come.

But part of the struggle that we have with that is finding ways that that doesn't become a place where people are trapped indefinitely. So we would like to be able to implement some of the reforms of the Clinton-era time when temporary assistance for needy families was transitioned in, and it has become such a great success on helping families be able to transition into work. The best way we can take care of families that are in the poverty area is not through a program from the government; it is with a great job so they have great self-esteem and they can be engaged and be a part of our ongoing economy.

The President's own debt commission made the comment that the Nation is broke, and what we need to do is focus on reducing spending and dealing with how we handle what we do as a Nation and what we're trying to accomplish.

As far as the issues about Medicare, we've been very clear through this process. We're dealing with Medicare changes for those that are 54 years old and younger. And for those that are in poverty and facing disability, those individuals would have full coverage, and as they're more wealthy, yes, we would means test that. We have an expectation that wealthier senior adults would be able to help cover more of their own Medicare; but for those that are in poverty or near the poverty range, they would be supplemented more to make sure that we're taking care of them, and it would be a guaranteed coverage like they have now so that they don't have to worry about not being able to get Medicare. They would be able to have it, and that would be secured for them.

We have one more major thing that we've all discussed. We all want taxes to be more simple in the process. Tomorrow is April 15, all of our favorite day in America, dealing with the taxes and dealing with the process. And it's not a matter of being a great citizen. It's just a matter of going through the tax forms. We need to simplify this process and make it more flat, more level and more fair for people across the board. So that's a major part of it. We're not talking about raising taxes $6 trillion. We're talking about keeping tax rates where they are and finding a way to be able to honor people and honor families.

□ 2150

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, how much time remains, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin, Ms. GWENDOLYNNE MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. The Congressional Black Caucus, the conscience of the Congress, rejects cuts that wage war on the poor and war on the working class. There are 43 of us from 21 States, and we represent over 30 million people. We are aggrieved that two-thirds of the Republican budget cuts come from programs that serve low-income and working class people while there is no sacrifice from the uber-wealthy class.

It is our job to be a voice in the wilderness and to point out that it is downright immoral to choose tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and billions of dollars of tax breaks and tax subsidies rather than preserving the dignity of a life with decent housing, food security, and access to health care for all Americans.

The gentleman who spoke previously just pointed out that they're cutting welfare because they believe that people need self-esteem. Well, you cannot eat self-esteem, and you cannot live in a house built on self-esteem. We want you to know that half of all Americans in this country are barely making it without any governmental support, and they need Medicaid. They don't need you to block grant it. ''Block granting'' means a cut. ''Block granting food stamps'' means a cut. Privatizing Medicare is a cut. Inflicting deep cuts to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and denying extended benefits to the unemployed is a cut.

Yet the Congressional Black Caucus prioritizes controlling the debt and deficit. We cut it by $4 trillion over 10 years. We, the CBC, submit that conservative fiscal policy is compatible with compassion for the invisible, voiceless majority of Americans who need their government to respond.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Chair, there has been much discussion today about shared sacrifice. The notion of shared sacrifice, let's disaggregate that for a moment.

We might have shared sacrifice for the next generation. We certainly are contemplating that right now if we fail to act in a responsible manner and address our Nation's debt crisis.

Shared sacrifice for the currently unemployed and underemployed in our country, that is what we are contemplating. If our solution to our Nation's problems is merely to increase taxes, we're going to see a decrease in job creation in this country. We will actually see our going the other direction in terms of employment in this country if we implement, as is proposed in this substitute, a tax increase of almost $6 trillion as compared to the budget that we are embracing on the Republican side.

We are imposing all manner of unnecessary sacrifice under this substitute on those Americans who are currently working and middle class. It contemplates a tax increase on capital gains and dividends at ordinary income rates. What that means, essentially, is we're thinking of taxing pensions and mutual funds at a rate as high as 49 percent. That would adversely impact our seniors. It's not the responsible thing to do.

Here in this proposal, we are also contemplating allowing all tax provisions of the 2001 and 2003 deals to expire for all taxpayers. In other words, this is a proposed tax increase on middle class Americans. I don't think that's the right thing to do right now.

Let's remind ourselves that we cannot tax our way out of this spending problem. Washington, once again, does not have a tax problem. We are not in this mess because we're not taxing the American people enough. Instead, we are in this mess because we're spending far too much.

This will become a familiar chart for Americans around the country, I hope, but let's look at this:

This is the ski slope of future spending projections, according to our Office of Management and Budget and Congressional Budget Office, if we do nothing. Those on the other side are seemingly proposing that we continue along this course or that we try and remedy this situation through job-constraining tax increases. That's not the way to go.

Finally, one statistic that was cited earlier tonight bears reiterating. If we were to tax everyone in this country who makes $250,000 or more—every family in this country, so that's just two income earners—at the $125,000 level and at 100 percent of their incomes, we still could not improve our financial situation enough to restore private sector job creation and put ourselves back on the path to prosperity. That is why I think we need to embrace this Ryan budget.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, the American people are confronting a dilemma, and the dilemma is simply this: to privatize or not to privatize. When all is said and done, that's the dilemma that we face based upon what the opposing party proposes.

The simple solution to education is to simply privatize and to give them vouchers. The simple solution to Social Security is to privatize and to place it in the stock market. The simple solution to health care is to privatize and to give them vouchers. For every complicated problem, there is a simple solution that's usually wrong.

As the economy continues to emerge from the worst recession in generations, the CBC budget understands the increased need for income security programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Unemployment insurance, Medicaid, and Section 8 housing vouchers.

As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I have worked hard over many years to ensure adequate funding levels for housing and community development programs, such as the Fair Housing Initiatives program and the HUD–Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program. I am pleased that the CBC budget supports investment in these key programs.

For Fiscal Year 2012, the Administration has requested $75 million for new HUD–Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers, which will end homelessness for an estimated 11,538 of our nation's veterans.

HUD–VASH combines tenant-based voucher assistance for homeless veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) at its medical centers in local communities.

Public housing authorities who are awarded HUD–VASH vouchers develop partnerships with VA medical centers to help homeless veterans find permanent supportive housing.

It is estimated that approximately 60,000 homeless veterans will need HUD–VASH vouchers. A recent report issued by HUD and the VA indicated that on a single night in January 2009, 75,609 veterans were homeless.

Over the past three fiscal years, Congress has appropriated $75 million a year for 10,000 new vouchers—for a total of 30,000 vouchers.

To continue moving towards the goal of ending veterans' homelessness, Congress should provide an additional 11,538 vouchers in FY 2012.

I am pleased that the CBC Budget makes homeless veterans a priority by providing additional funding to Section 8 which will ultimately ensure adequate vouchers in FY 2012.

The CBC Budget also provides additional funding for community and regional development programs. I am pleased that the Fair Housing Initiatives Program is listed among programs targeted to receive additional support.

This week marked the forty-third anniversary of the signing of the federal Fair Housing Act which was signed into law because of the efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. to bring civil rights and justice in housing to all Americans. The Fair Housing Act outlawed discrimination in housing based upon race, color, religion, and national origin.

Despite its passage more than 40 years ago, approximately 4 million fair housing violations are estimated to occur each year, many of which involve veterans and military personnel.

However, according to the National Fair Housing Alliance, just 30,000 are reported to federal, state, and local fair housing authorities and only a handful are investigated with less than 120 actually resulting in charges.

This number appears low given that housing discrimination is perceived to be one of the root causes of the current foreclosure crisis.

Fair housing education and enforcement, primarily provided by private, non-profit fair housing organizations, play an important role in fighting housing discrimination and predatory lending.

With support from the federal Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP), these organizations investigate over half of the nation's reported housing discrimination complaints, counsel people who have been victims of housing discrimination, and enforce fair housing laws through housing testing programs.

The President's Budget proposes $42.5 million in funding for the FHIP program in FY2012 which provides level funding from the previous year.

FHIP is a key federal program that provides funds to enforce the nation's fair housing laws, combat housing discrimination and ensure equal housing opportunities at the state and local level.

Given the ongoing foreclosure crisis, which has forced many families to enter the rental market, strengthened fair housing programs are more important than ever.

As the housing market slowly recovers, the need for sustained funding for fair housing enforcement is critically important. I am pleased that the CBC budget recognizes the importance of this program by providing additional funding for it as well.

In addition, I have introduced H.R. 284, the Veterans, Women, Families with Children, and Persons with Disabilities Housing Fairness Act of 2011, which aims to provide the necessary enforcement to guarantee equal opportunities and prosecute housing discrimination, as well as to be a deterrent for this kind of behavior.

It is my hope that these combined efforts will bring us closer to ending housing discrimination, especially against disabled persons and particularly against our veterans.

I ask my colleagues to vote "aye" on final passage of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2012.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to say that we don't offer a proposal to privatize Social Security. We do not do the things that were just said on this floor.

Nevertheless, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

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

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Chair, I rise tonight to also talk a little bit about the size and the scope and the number of employees that this Federal Government has. Earlier tonight, I talked about the State from which I come, Indiana—a AAA bond rating, not raising taxes on anybody, and a budget that year after year has been in the black.

As Secretary of State for Indiana for the last 8 years, I had operated a bureaucracy, and I know a little bit about them. What we had in Indiana, at least in the Secretary of State's office, was a pretty darned good one. We had no more employees in the Indiana Secretary of State's office than we did in the early '80s, and we were running on a 1987 budget, unadjusted for inflation.

I can tell by the reaction of some of the Members here in the House tonight that it's one of derision. It's one of scoffing. It can be done. The States know how to do it. Let's look to them.

In contrast to Indiana, what do we see here at the Federal level? We see 155,000 more bureaucrats than just a few years ago, an 80-plus-percent increase in the size and scope of this Federal Government, Madam Chairman—and that's just the personnel. We can have cuts in each of these departments. Every bureaucrat we don't hire after one retires will cause a 10 percent decrease in the Federal workforce over just a few years. That's responsible governing, especially when you're talking about a $14 trillion debt—$1 trillion year after year deficits.

As the previous Republican speaker pointed out, my friend TODD YOUNG, it's just getting worse. The red menace is upon us, and it's the red ink produced in this Federal Government, right here from the well of this House, to begin with. The Ryan proposal that came out of the Budget Committee addresses this in a responsible manner. The smaller we make this Federal Government, the more the private sector grows. It's correlational. It's definitional.

□ 2200

I urge my colleagues to pass this budget proposal, the Ryan proposal.

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative which lays out what I truly believe to be a more responsible way forward. In stark contrast to the irresponsible and reckless cuts proposed by the majority in the Ryan budget, the CBC budget alternative recognizes that not only can we not cut and slash our way to prosperity on the backs of our Nation's most vulnerable while protecting tax cuts for multimillionaires, but we also must invest in our Nation's future.

Our proposal creates jobs by investing in the green economy, diminishing our dependence on foreign oil, invests in our future by supporting programs that make education from the cradle to college more affordable, and protects the most vulnerable Americans.

Madam Chair, it is time we have an honest conversation with the American people about where we are: the greatest wealth transfer from the poor and the middle class to the rich and the wealthy in our lifetime. How we got here: Bush tax cuts, subprime scamming, and financial sector greed. And how we get to fiscal solvency: By supporting the CBC budget alternative. We are the conscience of the Congress.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire of the remaining time. We have no additional speakers except myself.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), a certified physician.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, which is responsible and responsive to the needs of all Americans, especially those who have been ignored and underserved in these hard economic times.

We reject the Republican budget that, while providing giveaways to the rich and corporations, sends seniors and people with disabilities out into the private insurance market with vouchers that will not cover, and so will increase, their costs, and that reopens the dreaded doughnut hole.

The CBC budget preserves Medicare, strengthens and extends it, and ends the doughnut hole. Republicans would cut Medicaid, denying health care to Americans who need prevention and care most, continuing the spiral of excess disabilities, illness, and premature death.

Our budget fully funds Medicaid and the Prevention and Public Health Fund, ensuring health care and the chance for wellness which many would not have without them.

We robustly fund HIV/AIDS, WIC, maternal and child health, and other programs to close gaps and bring better health to minorities, the poor, and Americans in rural areas and the territories.

Unlike the Republicans budget, we create millions of jobs, bring down costs, and further reduce the deficit. Vote for the CBC budget. Reject the harmful Republican budget.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. As a senior member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and as a former chairman of the committee's Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, I know that budget cuts do not build bridges. They also do not repair roads, and they do not expand our transit systems.

Unlike the majority's proposed budget which threatens to bring our transportation networks to a standstill, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget invests $20 billion above the President's budget in highways, transit, high-speed rail, and bridges. Such an investment in our Nation's infrastructure will move our recovering economy forward while creating at least 1 million jobs. Such investments will also ensure the mobility of our constituents so they can keep moving forward.

The CBC alternative budget makes investments in economic growth, and our Nation's needs, and I urge all Members to vote in favor of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan plan and in favor of the CBC budget. The CBC budget invests heavily in the education of our youngest citizens, from preschool to graduate school. This investment is necessary to ensure that all children receive the world class education they so greatly need and rightly deserve.

This investment is necessary to build the early childhood education system. We need to improve school readiness and reduce achievement gaps among students from different backgrounds. This investment is necessary to teach critical math and science skills, to improve graduation rates, and to provide for crucial college preparation programs such as TRIO and GEAR UP, all of which are essential for success in our technological world.

Madam Chair, education is a civil rights issue, and unless we educate all of our children, this country will never be what it ought to be. I support the CBC budget.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman has additional speakers. I am happy to yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri now controls 2½ minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding to the CBC.

The CBC budget saves $325 billion in interest over 10 years which the Republican budget does not. I am glad to stand here and talk about ports and public transit, but I am even more glad to talk about the $5 billion that goes into general sciences, space and technology, and the $5 billion for community development.

The reason I want to say that is for all of the tax cuts to the wealthy, $800 billion, the CBC budget understands that they can invest in health, income security, education, and transportation.

In addition, may I say to you that this is the face of what we are trying to fight for: a hardworking nurse and a beautiful child. This is what America is all about. And I would just say to my good friends, the CBC budget does not engage in slash-onomics. It does not engage in losing jobs, jobs, jobs. We create jobs through community block grants, through space, science, and technology, through transportation. And all the bill for the Republicans will do to America is slash jobs; slash-onomics. Vote for the CBC budget.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2012. The CBC Alternative Budget provides a far superior alternative to the Republican Budget in general and especially in the areas of job creating area of transportation and infrastructure.

IN GENERAL

The CBC Alternative Budget for FY 2012 puts forth a plan that reduces the deficit over the next decade, and increases economic opportunities and job creation while ensuring sustained investments in education, job training, transportation and infrastructure, and advanced research and development.

Deficit reduction and the path to fiscal sustainability must not be on the backs of the vulnerable. We cannot win the future by leaving our most vulnerable behind. Our success as a nation is interwoven in the success of every community. The CBC Alternative Budget is an honest and responsible path to prosperity.

Unlike the Republican Budget, the CBC Budget achieves all this by making tough but responsible decisions to raise new revenue by broadening the tax base, make our tax system fairer, and close corporate tax loopholes and preferences that have only contributed to the loss of American jobs. Instead of recklessly swinging the budget axe like the Republican leadership, the CBC budget makes targeted investments that will pay dividends for decades.

Compared to the President's budget, the CBC budget saves $5.7 trillion on the deficit over the next decade.

Compared to the Republican budget, the CBC budget saves $1.3 trillion on the deficit over the next decade.

EDUCATION

The CBC budget invests $20 billion over the President's Budget in Education and Job Training Programs.

The CBC Budget support the President's targeted investments towards education programs, but also restores the proposed cuts to the Community Services Block Grant and the $7.6 billion cut to year round Pell grants.

JOB CREATION & SOCIAL SAFETY NET

In the name of cutting spending, Republicans in Congress have recklessly swung the axe at programs that help vulnerable Americans. The blade did not spare Community Development Black Grants, food assistant programs, etc. The Republican budget all but wipes out these necessary programs at the time when more and more families are being pushing into poverty.

CBC budget provides states with the resources necessary to continue to preserve the social safety net while promoting sustainable job creation and economic growth. This proposed investment in infrastructure is supported by business, specifically the United States Chamber of Commerce.

CBC budget also provides $16 billion for H.R. 589, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Expansion and $2.5 billion for the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

For FY 2012, the CBC Budget sets aside $283.4 billion for deficit reduction. Over a 10 year period, the CBC budget sets aside $3.96 trillion of deficit reduction. Compared to the Republican budget, the CBC budget save $172 billion on the deficit in FY2012 and $1.34 trillion over the next decade.

TRANSPORTATION

The CBC budget provides $20 billion for Transportation Investment.

COMMUNITY & REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The CBC budget provides $5 billion for Community & regional Development.

CONCLUSION

By investing in infrastructure and other job creating areas, the CBC Alternative Budget offers the best and most fiscally responsible proposal to take America forward to economic prosperity.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, in closing, I am not accusing anybody of being mean-spirited and wanting to hurt people. I am absolutely convinced that those who support the Republican budget are good and decent Americans. They want the best things for this country. I will never stand on this floor and do that.

But what I am saying is I believe and our caucus believes that their program, their budget, is one that does damage to the vulnerable population of this country. We believe that somebody must stand up and speak for those who are hurting and cannot speak for themselves.

□ 2210

A budget is a moral document. It is a photograph of what we believe. It is a look into the somebodiness of the United States of America. And when we look at this budget that this Congress will ultimately approve, some budget, it is who we are. It is a biography of who we are. And I am absolutely convinced that the wrong budget—and I think that the budget that is before us is the wrong budget—could create a gash on the soul of America and leave a scar for a long, long time.

Madam Chair, this is a time that we must be careful because if we are not, great damage will be done to the people who can afford the damage the least. I'm talking about children. I'm talking about the elderly. And I'm talking about Americans who live next door to us, people who sit on the pew with us in church. These are people who are going to be hurt by this budget. And I think that the American public, when they come to understand this budget, will come to the conclusion that we're right.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, the United States of America is the greatest country on the face of the planet. We have overcome challenge after challenge for hundreds of years.

What makes America great is that entrepreneurial spirit, that can-do attitude, that idea that was inspired in the Constitution. See, I believe that the Constitution is an inspired, sacred document. But if we are going to continue to maintain our being the world's economic and military superpower, we're going to have to change the trajectory in which we are doing business.

Taxing, spending, borrowing money—that is not the pathway to prosperity. The American Dream is built upon the ideal that people need to take care of themselves. There is a proper role of government. And what we truly need in this country is fiscal discipline, limited government, accountability, and a strong national defense.

The Republican budget that has been put forward puts us on that trajectory, to retain and regain that fiscal sanity that we so desperately need in this country. Not only does our budget balance over the course of time, but it actually pays off the debt. And that, I think and I believe, is what we should be doing and what this budget that is put forth by the Budget Committee on the Republican side of the aisle truly does.

We have a moral obligation to leave this country better than how we found it. And if we are going to truly drive jobs and the economy forward, we are going to have to recognize that we need to empower the individual. We need to empower the entrepreneur so that they can be the very best they can in a very competitive global climate.

So, Madam Chair, I would urge the passage of the Republican budget, and I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this alternative that has been put forward during this last half hour.

I have enjoyed the debate. That's what makes this country great.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the alternative budget of the Congressional Black Caucus. This budget makes smart investments in our future by focusing on education, workforce training, and advanced research and development for clean energy technologies.

As you all know, minority communities took the hardest hit during the economic recession. In my district, we suffer from rates of unemployment and home foreclosure that are significantly higher than the rest of the country. Although our nation's economy is showing positive signs of growth, we must continue to make critical investments in our communities to facilitate our recovery. The CBC's alternative budget does this by investing $20 billion more than the President's Budget in education and job training programs that will prepare our young leaders to win the future.

While the CBC recognizes the importance of creating a budget that is fiscally responsible, we cannot slash spending and investment on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC's alternative budget reduces the deficit over the next decade and makes smart investments in education, job creation, and transportation and infrastructure. Without these investments, the United States will lose its competitive edge.

Unlike the Republican budget proposal, the CBC's alternative budget protects Medicare and Medicaid, and ensures that the most vulnerable in our society have access to quality healthcare services. The CBC's alternative budget also restores cuts to programs like the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, Community Development Block Grants and Pell Grants for students.

The CBC's alternative budget will also provide $20 billion more than the President's Budget for needed transportation and infrastructure projects. These investments will help to create jobs, facilitate the movement of goods, and help keep our economy moving forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the CBC's alternative budget plan, which reduces our deficit responsibly over the next decade and invests in the future prosperity of every American.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair is advised that amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 112–62 will not be offered.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to: