

budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class.

It's really outrageous what they're doing, Mr. Speaker. I just want to call them to task for saying they were committed to not doing the deeming, and now doing it.

□ 1220

TAX DAY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge everyone's least favorite day of the year, tax day.

In 1935, the 1040 Form was accompanied by a two-page instruction booklet. Today, taxpayers must wade through over 200 pages of instructions and a code that extends 4 million words in length and grows daily like an ever expanding blob entangling itself and attaching its burdens to the hopes and dreams of every American.

Yet as millions of Americans pay their taxes today, some in this town believe that Washington should actually tax and spend even more of the hard-earned dollars of the American people.

Instead, I believe we should first reform the Tax Code and work to control reckless and wasteful spending in the Federal budget. As it's been said: It's not that Washington taxes too little; it's that Washington spends too much.

Mr. Speaker, we must focus on reducing the tax burden on the American people, cutting spending here in Washington and working towards a bipartisan plan to reform the Tax Code and simplify it for the millions of tax-paying Americans that are counting on us.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS UNFAIR

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider legislation to make it easier to pass the Republican budget and to make it easier to pass a budget that is very unfair in its makeup. It's unfair because it continues to lavish tax breaks on the wealthiest people in this country while asking that the elderly in the Medicare program and that our poorest children in our elementary schools and young people struggling to pay for their college education all pay more to make room for a tax cut for millionaires that averages \$187,000 a year in a tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country.

It's not about wanting to tax more; it's about wanting tax fairness. It's about recognizing the economic disparity that exists in this country and how the Tax Code continues to lavish the benefits of the taxes that people do

pay back to the richest people in this country. And yet later this week, the Republicans are bringing yet another tax bill that will benefit the top 3 percent of the taxpayers in this country and add \$48 billion to the deficit this year and a half a trillion dollars to the deficit over 10 years.

That's not fair, it's not right, it's not equitable, and it needs to be rejected.

CONGRATULATING CENTER ON HALSTED

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Center on Halsted on its 5-year anniversary of building and strengthening the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community in Chicago.

On June 1 of 2007, I was proud to join residents from my district and across Illinois on the corner of Halsted and Waveland as Chicago's first permanent LGBT community center opened its doors. Since that time, Center on Halsted has become the Midwest's largest LGBT community center and a model for similar organizations across our Nation.

Patrons of all ages, backgrounds, and economic status participate in the wide assortment of public programs and social services offered at the center. Its youth program provides leadership training and professional development to more than 1,800 young people across Chicago. Social service programs include rapid HIV testing, group and individual psychotherapy, legal help, job training, and the Anti-Violence Project advocating for victims of hate crimes and domestic violence.

Under the leadership of CEO Modesto Tico Valle and the great efforts of so many people, Center on Halsted has grown into the phenomenal organization that it is today, welcoming the LGBT community and making our entire community a better place.

THE HUMPHREY-HAWKINS FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's time for a real jobs plan to get our Americans back to work in every district. And since the conservatives have taken over the House more than a year ago, they have refused to move forward with a real plan to create jobs to get our people back to work—a whole year and no comprehensive jobs plan when Americans needed it most.

Now, in my bill, H.R. 870, the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act, revised, is a way to bring unemployment down to zero percent. There is no reason why everybody that wants a job in America can't be put in a position or trained for a position.

Yet, although most of the people in the country treat jobs as the number one priority, we still haven't got movement in the House. It is a shame, and I think somebody is going to pay for it.

HONESTY ABOUT HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say they support small business owners, but other than keeping fact-checkers employed, Republican leaders are holding back those businesses by continuing to make false claims about the Affordable Care Act.

In my Louisville district, more than 15,000 small businesses could qualify for tax credits to help offset the cost of providing health insurance for their employees. A small business with 24 employees paying average health care costs could receive almost \$40,000 a year in tax credits right now under the Affordable Care Act, but only 530 out of those 15,000 businesses have taken advantage of it. The situation is like that across the country.

Why is that? Could it be that the people they elected to represent them in Congress have repeatedly told them that this law is bad for business?

As Members of Congress, I believe it is our responsibility to give our constituents an honest and accurate picture of what Federal laws and policies will do to affect their lives. And yet more than 2 years after the Affordable Care Act became law, Republican leaders continue to make false claims about it.

Mr. Speaker, the small business owners in my district appreciate knowing the truth about how Federal laws can benefit them.

THE RYAN BUDGET IS UNFAIR, UNBALANCED, AND UNWISE

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was so happy this week when I learned from our Presidential candidate, Mitt Romney, that the Republicans are now prepared to realize that women are a very important part of the economy. And that is why I'm wondering why Romney has embraced the Republican budget which would fix Medicare by cutting out \$30 billion in 10 years when 56 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries are women, and the oldest of old, 85 and older, 70 percent are women. Two-thirds of Medicaid recipients who are adults are women; and of the SNAP program—formerly known as food stamps—cut of \$134 billion, of the adult recipients, two-thirds of them are women.

So, in an environment where he claims that 92, 93 percent of all job losses have occurred among women, why would we snatch the safety net out

from under women with this cruel Republican budget?

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4089, SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE ACT OF 2012, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 614 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 624

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution (with the modifications specified in subsection (b)).

(b) In section 201(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, the following amounts shall apply:

(1) \$7,710,000,000 (in lieu of \$8,200,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with

respect to the Committee on Agriculture; and

(2) \$3,490,000,000 (in lieu of \$3,000,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with respect to the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1230

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 614 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are likely some in the underlying bill, H.R. 4089.

But before I begin, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state the inquiry.

Ms. MOORE. The rule clearly states, "Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have the force and effect in the House as though Congress had adopted such concurrent resolution."

Does this mean that the rule deems that the Senate will have passed H. Con. Res. 112?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution during its pendency. That is a matter for debate.

Ms. MOORE. Okay. We will have to debate this. The language, as I have construed it, says it shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress, which would include the Senate, had adopted such concurrent resolution. That is subject to debate.

So I want the House to be really clear here that, given this language, there is a real—it seems probable and likely that if we vote "yes" for House Concurrent Resolution 112, the Republican budget, which ends Medicare for a voucher system, ends the entitlement under Medicaid, cuts food support, cuts funds by \$134 billion over 10 years, that we could be deeming this to be passed.

I am raising again, Mr. Speaker, the question about that use of "Congress

has adopted such concurrent resolution," meaning also the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would reiterate that the issue is a matter for debate, and the Chair will not interpret the language of the resolution during its pendency.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your lack of clarity.

I raise this point of order because it's important to uncover whether or not the underlying rule for this Natural Resources bill—it's a Natural Resources bill—also deems the Republican budget plan to end Medicare as we know it, slash funding for SNAP.

When it comes to the Republican budget, my Democratic colleagues are most definitely not asleep at the wheel. And we want to take this moment to shed light on what's going on here.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a member of that prestigious committee, the House Committee on the Budget, and a long-time advocate for sound budgetary policy. I recognize the importance of tackling our deficit and debt head-on, carefully balancing both the spending and revenue-raising sides of our ledger.

But House Republicans, led by my dear colleague from Wisconsin, have put out a budget that is neither sound nor balanced. This budget finds a jaw-dropping 62 percent of its \$5.3 trillion in nondefense budget cuts over 10 years from programs that serve the most vulnerable of our society, the poor, and I might add in the most vulnerable, women and children, since we've just recently established in this last week that women were very important in our economy.

In addition to the sheer magnitude of these raw numbers, I want to make it clear that the Republican budget contains major departures from current policy. This budget heralds welfare reform as a vital victory and plots the next chapter of so-called "reforms" for other areas of the safety net.

Our core programs are not spared by this budgetary trick. This budget takes an aim at Medicare. We're told that by stripping Medicare of its entitled status, cutting \$30 billion out of Medicare, that we're going to save it. We're going to save Medicare by subtracting \$30 billion. That's not the kind of math I learned at North Division High.

And we're going to set seniors adrift in the private market. Now, this budget does nothing to cut the cost of health care in the private market. It only passes those costs on to seniors.

The cuts to the SNAP program have not gotten as much attention as the Medicare cuts, even though they are cause for collective alarm. As we know, over half of our citizens in the United States, working people, many of them, found themselves with no other income. They had no job. We played phony baloney with the unemployment insurance. They had nothing except SNAP, formerly known as food stamps.

□ 1240

And so they had no other income other than the food stamp program,