

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 gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his heroic work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, history walks with us as we debate this budget. History offers us not a single example of a nation that has ever spent and borrowed and taxed its way to prosperity, not one. But it offers us many, many examples of nations that have spent and borrowed and taxed their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

And history is screaming this warning at us: that nations that bankrupt themselves aren't around very long because before you can provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, you have to be able to pay for it, and the ability of our Nation to do so is now in grave danger.

Yesterday, the President attacked this budget because he says it lowers taxes on the rich while raising Medicare costs for seniors. In fact, this budget ends many of the loopholes that have allowed some of the wealthy to pay less than their fair share of taxes, while it lowers the overall rate for those who have paid more. And since 82 percent of small business income is affected, economists tell us that the tax relief provided by this plan will produce a million new jobs next year. I say to the gentleman from Maryland, that's the healthy way to produce new revenue.

The President apparently believes that by taking more money from small businesses, somehow they will create more jobs. That is the economic folly that misguides this administration.

As my friends to my left know, Medicare and Medicaid will collapse if we continue business as usual. This budget saves those systems by putting them on a sound financial foundation. It reverses the growing trend of doctors refusing to treat Medicare patients, and it assures future seniors a far wider choice of physicians and plans than is available today.

This budget brings Federal spending back under control, and it places our Nation on a path so that when my children retire, their retirement systems will be safe and secure and their Nation will be debt free and prosperous.

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

I remind the gentleman that what we're saying is that the top 2 percent income earners should go back to the

same rates they were paying during the Clinton administration, a period of time when the economy was roaring and 20 million jobs were created. When we moved to the current rates for the folks at the very top, we saw at the end of 8 years, 2000 to 2008, a loss of over 625,000 private jobs.

Let me just say something about this Medicare issue because what the Republican plan does will result in rationing by income. Let me be clear. Seniors, you will no longer be able to choose to stay in the Medicare program. You've got to go into the private health insurance market. You're going to be given a voucher, premium, whatever you want to call it, that doesn't keep pace with rising health care costs. That means that the plan you may be able to afford may not cover the very benefits you need, and your doctor certainly may not be on that plan. So you lose your choice of doctor if you can't happen to afford the plan that they're on, or you lose your benefits. This Republican plan is rationing by the insurance industry.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the best way to balance any budget for our country is to get everyone back to work who wants to work. The President's bipartisan fiscal commission also shows any responsible effort requires a balanced approach that addresses both spending and revenues. By contrast, this budget from the Republicans fails the simple test of addressing both programs—program spending as well as tax break spending—and it fails it badly.

The Republican budget increases tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors, doubling their out-of-pocket costs for their insurance premium. And at the same time Republicans are doling out a trillion dollars of tax breaks over the next 10 years to the wealthiest people in our country, to multinational corporations and to those on Wall Street who pay as little as 11 percent of taxes.

Meanwhile, the Republican budget will end Medicare as we know it, and it will throw America's seniors at the mercy of insurance companies. Seniors love Medicare, and their families love Medicare. Social Security and Medicare are compacts of trust between generations, and I would not want the next generation to have any less than our generation has had, and I disagree with the Ryan proposal because it divides generations.

The Democratic alternative stands in clear contrast. It reduces the deficit while preserving the social safety net. In fact, the plan of House Democrats would cut the deficit by an additional \$1.2 trillion more than the President's budget. It achieves primary balance as early as fiscal year 2018, and puts our economy on a full path to recovery.

The Ryan budget fails to say the reasons for the deficit we face—the \$1.4

trillion in the cost of the Afghan and Iraqi wars and the billions and billions spent on Wall Street in bailing them out and all of the costs of unemployment and housing foreclosure that has gone with it.

The Republican budget gives up on jobs and working Americans and caters mainly to the upper 1 percent. And, frankly, it gives up on America's future. The Ryan budget is the roadmap to ruin. It won't create jobs. In fact, it will cause more job loss. It's a dead end budget for America, and I ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to simply say that it is well known that our budget doesn't touch Medicare, change it for people in or near retirement, 55 years old or above. But under the President's plan, if the 15-person board says your doctor can't give you the care he wants to, or your hospital can't do it, then they can't. That's the government doing this, unelected bureaucrats, to current seniors; and we oppose that.

□ 1810

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the distinguished State of Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Budget Committee and former small business owner, I rise today in strong support of the Budget Committee's 2012 budget resolution.

I would like to begin today with a quote from a famous American:

"At what point can we have a serious conversation about Medicare and its long-term liability, or a serious conversation about Social Security or serious conversation about budget and debt where we aren't simply trying to position ourselves politically? That's what I'm committed to doing."

Mr. Chairman, that was President Barack Obama just last year. As we debate this budget, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to heed the words of our President. Let's stop the demagoguery and the political jockeying and actually work toward a solution together. Our children—my grandchildren—deserve no less.

Even most Democrats agree that our current spending is on an unsustainable trajectory. So wouldn't you agree that finger-pointing and making false claims to scare seniors while offering no solutions of your own is counterproductive?

This budget has real solutions and real ideas. We cut spending by \$6.2 trillion and shrink the size of government to historically normal—historically normal—levels. We start to get our deficits under control and put our budget on a path to prosperity.

As a small business owner, I know what high taxes mean to job creators in this country. That's why our budget calls for a flatter, fairer tax—now wait for it—that closes loopholes and increases the incentives of corporations to keep jobs right here in America.

I know what small businesses look for when they look to spend and invest. They look for certainty. And this budget, more than anything else, puts our country back on a certain path of sustainability. Job creators and business owners will stand up and cheer when they see real ideas like this put forth.

There are many more ideas of merit in this budget, and we all want a vigorous debate. But I hope it will be a debate on policy differences, not political maneuvering.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out again that the choice is whether we want to ask for shared sacrifice. The fact of the matter is the reason the bipartisan fiscal commission said that the Republican budget isn't balanced was, among other things, because it asks for nothing from the folks at the very top who got the big tax cuts.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget plan, which is not, as they characterize, a pathway to prosperity but a true pathway to poverty for our Nation.

The Republicans' explicit choice to protect millionaires and special interests at the expense of job creation is dangerous and forsakes our future.

I'm particularly concerned about the reckless and shameful cuts to the National Institutes of Health for the research of cures to cancer, stroke, diabetes, heart disease, and all the other illnesses that fall under its jurisdiction. That is why last week I introduced an amendment in committee that would stop these cuts. Yet each and every one of our Republican colleagues voted against it.

For just half a percent—half a percent—of the cost of extending tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, we could completely reject the Republicans' devastating cuts to medical research for next year. Cuts of this magnitude will slow research progress while squandering critical scientific opportunities that may one day save lives.

Yet beyond the dangers posed to our Nation's health, these cuts prevent us from winning the future.

The Republicans' cut to NIH kills jobs. NIH grants support more than 350,000 highly skilled jobs in all 50 States, plus an additional 800,000 supporting jobs created in the private sector. This means that the Republican budget puts over 1 million American jobs at risk—from pharmaceutical jobs to medical device manufacturers to technicians working in medical labs. At the same time, the Republican path to poverty ignores the NIH's role in reducing the rising cost of chronic disease and the ballooning costs that compound our debt.

We must make smart investments in our Nation's medical and fiscal health. And we must make these kinds of in-

vestments now so that we may stem the tide of future disease rates.

Cancer incidence is projected to nearly double by 2020, particularly among the aging baby boomer population. As one of the 11 million cancer survivors in the United States, I am living proof of the vital gains made by research at NIH.

We can't stop now. Don't turn your back on the millions of Americans who are desperately holding out hope that treatments and cures are coming to them soon.

Prevent these deadly cuts. Oppose this Republican path to poverty.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget.

At the end of the day, this is about jobs, it's about our economy, and it's about the people's money.

You see, all too often Congress talks about its money, talks about the way it wants to spend the people's money. No. It's the people's money. It's not Congress's to just go and allocate and pull their money out of their wallets to hand to somebody else. What we have to recognize each and every time a decision is made about where and how to spend money is that they're pulling money out of people's pockets and handing it to somebody else. And right now we're on a trajectory where 25 cents—25 cents—out of every dollar spent in this country is spent by the Federal Government.

Fundamentally that's wrong. We have to change the trajectory. We have to have systemic changes. And that's what I like about this budget. Because not only does it put us on a pathway to balance the budget but to actually pay off the debt.

I ran for Congress because I was sick and tired of what was happening. I wanted to be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

We have to recognize that our national debt just 48 months ago was \$8.67 trillion. Yet with the Democrats in control of the House and the Senate, it rose to over \$14 trillion, a rise of more than 60 percent in just 48 months. We can't continue to do that.

What I like about this budget is that it's an adult conversation that says we're going to have to change the trajectory, everything from entitlement reform to the discretionary spending.

This budget cuts \$6.2 trillion in government spending over the next decade compared to the President's budget. It eliminates hundreds of duplicative programs and brings government spending to below 20 percent of the economy—its proper role, its proper level.

We can no longer continue to borrow, tax, and spend our way. We have to reduce spending. We have to produce a responsible Federal budget. That's what this budget does. That's why I'm in support of it. And I urge the passage of this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that those hardworking American workers paid their payroll taxes, including their Medicare contributions, and they should have the benefit of the bargain and keep the Medicare guarantee.

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

Mr. TONKO. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the chart to my right, the Republican Road to Ruin budget ends Medicare and other investments to pay for tax breaks to millionaires and some of the most profitable corporations in the world.

Forty-six million Americans rely on Medicare for their health care today. Under the Road to Ruin plan to end Medicare, seniors and the disabled will lose their guaranteed health benefits. They will be left with a voucher. By design, the voucher cannot and will not keep up with rising health care costs.

□ 1820

The private market views seniors and the disabled as a risky and expensive investment. That's why Medicare was created in the first place. As a result, when the Road to Ruin health plan takes effect—and as this chart again to my right reveals—seniors will see their health costs double. By conservative estimates, seniors will pay more than \$12,000 in out-of-pocket expenses for the same coverage Medicare provides today. Facing dramatically higher health costs with less help, our seniors will be forced into life-and-death decisions—do I buy groceries or do I buy prescriptions? Do I pay rent or do I pay medical bills?

Never fear, my Republican colleagues say to seniors, you will get the same care as a Member of Congress. Well, as a Member of Congress, I know that congressional health plans cost about \$9,000 this year. Seniors will be getting a ration of \$8,000 10 years from now for health care that will cost over \$20,000. With all due respect, I must say that the Republican talking point that seniors will get the same coverage as a Member of Congress is not just political hyperbole, it is a lie. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that seniors will pay 68 percent of their health costs under the Republican plan. Members of Congress only pay 28 percent of their premiums. Seniors will pay more than double the share that Members of Congress pay and more than double the amount that they pay today under Medicare.

We have balanced a budget before without ending Medicare. We can do it again. I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the Road to Ruin plan that would end Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, for the last several weeks—and my guess is

for the next couple of days—we will be hearing a lot of things from our colleagues across the aisle about the relationship between cutting spending and jobs. They have taken the position from the very beginning that if we cut government spending, we are going to lose jobs.

We heard earlier this evening my esteemed colleague from Maryland talk about the Zandi report that suggested that maybe if we cut \$60 billion from the budget—as we did in the CR, H.R. 1, a few weeks ago—that that would cost us somehow 500,000 jobs. I've seen a similar report suggesting that that same \$60 billion cut would shave 2 percentage points off of GDP. Mr. Chairman, those numbers sort of expose the absurdity of the Democrat argument.

If you took those same numbers and applied it to the \$800 billion stimulus program, that \$800 billion stimulus program should have created or would have created over 6.5 million jobs and added 26 percent to the GDP. It's just wrong. It's misleading.

I think for the first time maybe in this generation the American people are starting to accept the fact that government spending does not create jobs. We've seen it. It was an expensive lesson for us to learn as a Nation, but we are learning it. If government spending created jobs, then I wouldn't have 15 percent unemployment in my district. People back home are starting to accept, they are starting to learn, starting to agree that what creates jobs in this Nation is private investment. It's private businesses investing in their business, and it's private individuals putting people to work.

We've got a graph going back another 20 years here—and I've got another one that goes back another 40 years, and another one that goes back to World War II—that shows that the only thing that creates jobs in this Nation is private investment. You are not going to find a graph more directly correlated than this. When private investment goes up, the unemployment rate goes down. When private investment goes down, the unemployment rate goes up. That is what we are facing as a Nation. And until we recognize the fact that government spending does not create jobs, we will continue to muddle through, but with too many of our folks out of work. This budget allows private industry to get back in the job of investing in this country and putting people back to work.

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

Mr. Chairman, of course, the private sector is the engine of opportunity and the economy in this country. But we also know that there are some investments that no individual or corporation takes on by themselves. For example, the highway system and some of the big infrastructure, you've got 20 percent unemployment in the construction industry right now. If you're telling me that a greater investment in our infrastructure, roads, and bridges

doesn't help generate job creation, then you should tell that to the folks who are looking for a job right now.

I would also point out that the same folks—the Heritage Foundation—who said that the Republican plan that we're talking about tonight was going to miraculously increase jobs are the same people who, back at the beginning of the Bush administration, predicted that those tax cuts were going to generate all sorts of jobs in the country. Here's what they predicted in blue; cut those taxes for the folks at the very top, jobs are going to go up and up and up. Here's the reality in red. We know what happened. So I would be careful about talking about how a budget is going to produce jobs.

We have an alternative budget that has the right balance between cuts and shared sacrifice and will generate jobs.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our seniors, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget that ends Medicare.

The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee in 11 short years. In 11 years, reliable care for our seniors will be replaced with the risky voucher scheme.

The Republican plan supposedly generously gives senior citizens a gift, an \$8,000-a-year voucher. Seniors then must identify an insurance carrier that will take it. This is called choice. Since the Republicans also want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there is nothing to protect seniors from being excluded from coverage if they have a pre-existing condition. This is called choice. I don't know too many people 55 years and older who don't have some health-related problem.

There is nothing that protects seniors from insurance companies canceling their coverage if an illness becomes too expensive, so I don't know where the choice is. There is nothing that will protect taxpayers from incurring massive costs when uninsured seniors show up in emergency rooms around the country with untreated diabetes leading to kidney failure and heart disease, and untreated hypertension leading to strokes. This isn't much of a choice.

We are simply fooling ourselves if we think all seniors will be able to just write a check and pay the difference. A more likely scenario is seniors will simply not have medical coverage.

I often say that you can judge a society by how it treats its elderly and its children. And the Republican budget plan kicks our seniors to the curb while the wealthiest Americans will continue to get wealthier.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican budget and protect the Medicare benefit.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

These are serious times that we're in right now with regard to the debt and deficit. Serious times call for a serious budget, and this is a serious budget. This is one that can actually lead us out of the problems we're in. That is what we need.

For those on the other side of the aisle who are saying that they want to preserve Medicare by sticking to the status quo, as I think it was George Will said on Sunday, Your problem isn't Mr. RYAN, it's Mr. Arithmetic. It just doesn't work. You just can't do it.

So for all this talk about preserving Medicare, preserving Medicare as it currently is means that you are consigning it to history. It won't survive. You have to change it. You have to change it in ways that make it sustainable and solvent for the long-term future.

What we are hearing now is that we need more investment, and that we've got to maintain current spending levels to have more investment. I would refer you to the stimulus that we just passed a year or so ago. What good has that done? Sure, it's a lot more investment or spending—or whatever you call it—government to government, or the government spending, but it is not enabling the private sector to create jobs.

The job of the Federal Government should be to set a conducive tax and regulatory environment so that the private sector can produce jobs. That's what this budget does. That is why I support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Now we have two cities here—St. Augustine talked about it. We are looking at a city very optimistically, and unfortunately we have to go back to your figures.

We have had exactly six quarters of growth in this administration. You want to know what the last two quarters of the last administration's growth was? It wasn't very good, was it, Mr. RYAN?

The point of the matter is that you have two different visions of America's future, two different cities on that hill. You continue to use the payroll tax, which pays for Medicare A, and you continue to say all those under 55 years of age are going to go to a new plan, yet you continue the payroll tax. This is somewhat like—this is exactly like, not somewhat like—what you did with the doughnut hole. You forced seniors to pay premiums and they got no benefits. You know it, I know it, and the proof is what it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

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 Demo-

crats' 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. RISCCH).

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.