

is not stewardship. It is not governance. It is barbarism.

NATO SUMMIT

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call attention to the NATO summit that will take place next week in Chicago.

NATO was founded with the signing of the Washington Treaty in 1949 to safeguard the freedom and security of all of its members. Since then, the alliance has been the mainstay of the transatlantic cooperation that has been an important part of this Nation's security.

All 27 of our NATO allies, along with 22 non-NATO partners, have served shoulder to shoulder with our brave men and women in Afghanistan, working to ensure that that country never again becomes a safe haven for terrorists.

In Chicago, we will continue important discussions on the transition of security responsibility from ISAF to the Afghans. Particularly in today's global economic environment, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the value of NATO as a proven force multiplier. The alliance is working to ensure that NATO is well prepared for future challenges.

As we welcome our friends to Chicago on May 20 and 21, we affirm the vitality of this transatlantic bond and of our continued commitment to our common defense.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5652, SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 648 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-21 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you coming in early to be with us early this morning. This is a big day. This is the reconciliation bill.

I serve on both the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we've had some tremendous successes in the appropriations process. This week, we've been working through the Commerce-Justice-Science bill. It's a bill that's reduced spending to those levels that we had in 2008, doing those things that the voters sent us here to do.

We're going to vote on that bill today in final passage. But that appropriations process that we have control over here in the House, that process where we reduced spending from 2010 levels down to 2011 levels, down to 2012 levels, and are going to go down again to 2013 levels to be responsible stewards of taxpayers' dollars, those are only one-third of the taxpayer dollars.

Two-thirds of the taxpayer dollars that are spent in this town—and by spent I really mean borrowed and then spent—come on what they call mandatory spending programs. Mr. Speaker, as you know, mandatory spending programs are dollars that go out the door whether Congress acts or not. Appropriation bills require Congress to act affirmatively, but mandatory spending goes right out the door without any oversight from this body until you get to reconciliation.

Reconciliation is that process that Democrats put in place wisely years and years ago to allow the House and the Senate to come together and begin to reduce, restrain, do oversight on those mandatory spending dollars. This is a rule that brings that bill to the floor.

That bill is going to be coming under a closed rule, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about a bill that has been put together by almost every committee of jurisdiction here in this House and then assembled by the Budget Committee and brought here to the floor. It's been the subject of countless hearings already. We looked at whether we'd be able to bring a Democratic substitute to the floor. None was submitted that complied with the rules of the House.

So we have one bill on the floor today, an up-and-down vote, on whether or not we're willing to engage in the

first serious reconciliation process on this floor—I would argue—since 1997. Some folks might say 2003. I say 1997. Why, Mr. Speaker?

□ 0920

I'll tell you, it's the right thing to do anyway. It's the right thing to do anyway as responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. But in this case, these aren't reductions for the sake of reductions. These are reductions for the sake of complying with what I would argue is a very good deficit-reduction agreement between the President and the Senate and the House last August. And as a part of that agreement, we put in some blanket cuts to national security, some blanket cuts to national defense. And some commentators have described these cuts, Mr. Speaker, as being intentionally so crazy that they would never happen but would be used only as a tool to get the Joint Select Committee to act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Joint Select Committee did not succeed last fall. It's a source of great frustration for me and is also a source of great frustration for the Members who served on that committee. They had an opportunity to bring an up-or-down vote to both the House and the Senate floor on anything they came up with, Mr. Speaker. They didn't have to get the whole \$1.2 trillion. They didn't have to get \$1.5 trillion. They could have gotten \$1 trillion. They could have gotten \$500 billion. They could have gotten \$250 billion, and we would have brought that to the floor for an up-or-down vote. But they got nothing.

So where are we? Well, in the words of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, he says:

We are at a place where, if these cuts were allowed to go, the impact of these cuts would be devastating to the Defense Department.

I happen to share his concerns. Again, these were across-the-board cuts put in place to be so intentionally crazy that Congress would never allow them to occur, and it would spur the Joint Committee to action.

I happen to have supported an amendment offered by CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, the ranking member on the Budget Committee. When we were going through the Budget Committee process last year, he offered an amendment that said, dadgummit, everything's got to be on the table, and that includes the Defense Department. I agree with him. The Defense Department does need to be on the table. And in fact, the Defense Department is undergoing \$300 billion worth of reductions today.

This bill does nothing to change that. There is \$300 billion being reduced from the Defense Department, as well it should. It's not easy, but it should happen, and it is happening. This isn't dealing with that. This is dealing with even additional cuts. Again, in the words of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, a former Democratic Member of this House:

The impact of these cuts would be devastating for the Department.

So we have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to do what, I would argue, you and I came here to do—and not just you and I, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—to do those things not just that happened year after year after year, those things that have 12 months of efficacy and then go away, but the things that can be set in permanent law to change the direction of spending and borrowing in this country. And, candidly, Mr. Speaker, it's more about the borrowing than it is about the spending.

There are priorities in this country that we need to focus on, and I would argue that we've done a great job of focusing on those priorities. But when you are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar from your children and your grandchildren, we have to redefine what responsibility is because, I will tell you, that is irresponsible.

And this bill then takes a step in two directions: one, turning back this second round of Defense Department cuts—not the first round but the second round, the round that Leon Panetta describes as devastating to the Defense Department—and then setting us on a path to bend that cost curve going forward by tackling mandatory spending programs for the first time in almost a decade.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule. It is totally closed, and it denies Democrats, led by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the substitute.

We're not asking for dozens of amendments or something that hasn't been done in the past with regards to reconciliation bills. All we are asking for is one vote on our substitute, one vote on what we believe is a better alternative to the Republican bill. Last night in the Rules Committee, every single Republican—every single one of them—voted to deny Democrats that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as one who does not believe in arbitrary and thoughtless across-the-board cuts as a way to balance our budget, I want to support Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute in order to avoid the implementation of the Budget Control Act's sequester. In my opinion, to allow this sequester to go into full effect would be bad for the country.

We are here in this awful mess because a so-called supercommittee failed to reach agreement last fall on a

comprehensive and balanced deficit-reduction plan due in very large part to the absolute refusal of Republicans to put revenues on the table. Bowles-Simpson, Rivlin-Domenici, and the Gang of Six all had deficit-reduction proposals that sought to be balanced with both spending cuts and revenues. They sought to be fair. They realized that you cannot solve our long-term fiscal problems by slashing and burning the last century of social progress in America.

But, today, my Republican friends have brought to the floor a reconciliation bill that actually makes sequestration look good. What's going on here is very simple—very troubling, but very simple. They are protecting the massive Pentagon budget and demanding no accountability by exempting it from sequestration and finding even deeper cuts in programs that benefit the people of this country.

The bill before us would create a government where there is no conscience, where the wealthy and well connected are protected and enriched, and where the middle class, the poor, and the vulnerable are essentially forgotten. I have never seen anything like this. It is outrageous. It takes my breath away.

My friends won't cut billions in subsidies for Big Oil at a time when oil companies are making record profits and gauging Americans at the pump. They won't address the inequities of the Tax Code, which allows billionaire Warren Buffett to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary. The revenues from fixing these two unjust policies alone would result in billions and billions and billions of dollars in deficit reduction. But the Republicans have protected Big Oil, and they've protected the billionaires. However, my Republican friends take a meat-ax to SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. This is a program to help poor people afford food.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should heed the words of President John F. Kennedy:

If a free society will not help the many who are poor, they cannot save the few who are rich.

Mr. Speaker, we are one country. We should care about one another, especially those who are most vulnerable. That's not a weakness or something we should be ashamed of. Rather, it's something that makes us strong and great.

As my friends know, I have spent a lot of time and effort in Congress on the issues of hunger, food insecurity, and nutrition. Tens of millions of our fellow citizens don't have enough to eat, and every single one of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—should be ashamed. And that's why I am so outraged by the \$36 billion in SNAP cuts.

This notion that SNAP promotes a culture of dependency, that SNAP is a golden ticket to prosperity is just wrong. Some on the Republican side have even claimed that SNAP enslaves

Americans. Give me a break. In fact, even in 2010, when unemployment was close to 10 percent and jobs were scarce, the majority of SNAP households with a nondisabled working-age adult were working households—working households.

Working families are trying to earn more. No one wakes up in the morning dreaming to be on SNAP, but these are tough economic times. Some people have no choice. But we know that SNAP enrollment and spending on SNAP will go down as the economy improves, as families see their incomes rise and no longer need SNAP to feed their families. Don't take my word for it. This is directly from the Congressional Budget Office.

Of course, last night in the Rules Committee, we heard the tired line that there's a lot of abuse in the SNAP program. We heard that there are countless numbers of people receiving benefits who do not deserve them. That, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true.

It's a common and unfortunate misconception that SNAP is rife with fraud, waste, and abuse. Many have decried SNAP as a handout that can be sold or traded for alcohol and other items that shouldn't be purchased with taxpayer funds. It cannot. And to the extent that there is abuse, the USDA is cracking down on it.

SNAP is both effective and efficient. In fact, the error rate for SNAP is not only at an all-time low, but it has among the lowest—if not the lowest—error rate of any Federal program. If only we could find a program at the Pentagon that had such a low error rate.

Last night we also heard about categorical eligibility, a process in which a low-income person is automatically eligible for food stamps if they are already enrolled in another low-income assistance program.

□ 0920

Categorical eligibility—and I think it's important to state this because there's such misconception here. Categorical eligibility makes it easier for poor people, those people who are already approved for low-income assistance programs, to receive SNAP benefits. But it also makes it easier on the States that have to administer these programs. This saves time and money and paperwork, because the people who are already eligible for similarly administered benefits do not have to re-apply for SNAP, and States do not have to waste workers' hours processing paperwork for people who are already eligible based on their incomes.

Categorical eligibility does not mean that people who don't qualify for SNAP get those benefits. To the contrary, people still have to qualify for the program to receive food. Any claim that this is a fraudulent practice or that it is rife with abuse is just another falsehood and smear against one of the most efficient Federal programs.

The demonization of SNAP and other food and nutrition programs by my Republican friends must come to an end.

We have an obligation in this country to provide a circle of protection for the most vulnerable.

Cutting \$36 billion means that more than 22 million households will see a cut in their benefit. This means 22 million families will have less food tomorrow than they do today. In fact, 2 million people would be cut from the SNAP program altogether. Another 280,000 kids will lose access to free school meals.

My friends on the other side of the aisle don't like to hear this, but sometimes the truth hurts. If this bill before us becomes law, it will take food out of the mouths of children in America, all in the name of protecting tax cuts for the wealthy and increased Pentagon spending. The Republican reconciliation bill threatens Medicare, it threatens children's programs, it threatens educational programs, as well as programs that support our infrastructure. In short, if this were to be adopted as law, it would threaten our economy as a whole.

And the bill not only protects the Pentagon budget, it increases it by billions of dollars. Does anyone here honestly believe there's not a single dollar to be saved anywhere in the Pentagon? If you do, you're not reading the newspapers. It's there in front of us every single day, the abuse that goes on. No-bid defense contractors. I can go on and on and on.

We have, and will continue to have, the strongest military on the face of the Earth. But at some point national security must mean more than throwing billions of dollars at unnecessary nuclear weapons or at pie-in-the sky Star Wars programs that will never actually materialize.

But national security has to mean taking care of our own people. It means educating our children. It means an infrastructure that isn't crumbling around us. It means clean air and clean water and a health care system that works. Those should be our priorities. But sadly, those are not the priorities in the bill before us today.

Of course, Senator REID says the bill is dead in the water in the Senate. At a press conference yesterday, the Senate Majority Leader said:

As long as Republicans refuse to consider a more reasonable approach, one that asks every American to pay his fair share while making difficult choices to reduce spending, the sequester is the only path forward.

That's a pretty clear statement that the Senate will not consider this bill. Quite frankly, it's the right thing to do.

A reasonable approach is what the American people want. Yes, they want us to get our fiscal house in order. They want us to reduce the deficit in a fair way so that the wealthiest among us pay their fair share. But mostly the American people want jobs, something the House Republican leadership continues to ignore.

The American people know that the best way to bring this deficit down is

through job creation. They want the economy to improve. They want their lives to get better. This bill does not do that.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by quoting President Dwight Eisenhower in a speech he made in 1953:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that President Eisenhower wouldn't recognize today's Republican Party.

We should reject this closed rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I say to my friend, as the Republican Budget chairman said to him yesterday, I appreciate his passion on this issue. What brings us to the very best decisions that we can make in this body, Mr. Speaker, is having folks who work hard day in and day out educating themselves on the issues. They can bring the very best case for the American people to the floor.

And that's why I would ask my friend whether or not he believes it actually helps that debate to get involved in some of those rhetorical feats of mind, I guess we would call them, because he knows as well as I know that under the law of the land, in 2002, food stamp benefits, SNAP benefits, would have gone up by about 40 percent over the last 10 years, and Republicans and Democrats came together over the last decade and increased those benefits 270 percent, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this proposal suggests that instead of going up 270 percent, we allow those benefits to go up 260 percent. That's the draconian cut.

We see that in the same rhetoric in the student loan program, Mr. Speaker. Everyone in this body knows the law of the land was that student loan rates were at 6.8 percent—a below-market rate of 6.8 percent. They were lowered for a very small fraction of the student population for a very temporary period of time to 3.4 percent, and the law now hasn't gone back to 6.8 percent, to standard levels. But folks want to talk about that as a doubling instead of a returning to common law.

And more importantly, Mr. Speaker, to continue to suggest, as he knows is not the case, that Republicans are unwilling to focus on the Defense Department, let me say it plainly. I believe there is waste and fraud and abuse in the Defense Department, and I stand here willing to work with you to eradicate it all. I supported Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN's amendment to put Defense on the table. The budget that this House passed—the only budget that's passed in all of Washington, D.C.—reduced defense spending by \$300 billion in recognition of exactly that.

And, Mr. Speaker, again, the rhetoric just gets a little overheated from time to time, and, candidly, I think it gets

in the way of us doing the people's business. When I say to you that Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, on August 4, 2011, said:

If these defense cuts happen—and God willing that will not be the case, but if it did happen—it would result in a further round—because we've already cut once; in fact, already cut twice—a further round of very dangerous across-the-board defense cuts that I believe, says Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense, would do real damage to our security, our troops, and their families.

I would say to my friend: How does it advantage us to make this a Republican-Democratic issue when the Democratic chairman of the House Budget Committee, Leon Panetta, says allowing these cuts to go forward would be dangerous to our defense, to our national security, to our troops, and to our families? How does it advantage us to make this a Republican-Democratic issue when President Clinton's OMB Director, Leon Panetta, says this would be dangerous across-the-board defense cuts that would do real damage to our security, our troops, and our families? How does it advantage us to make this a partisan issue when President Clinton's Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, former OMB Director, former Democratic Budget Committee chairman, says: I believe allowing these cuts to go forward would do real damage to our security, to our troops, and to our families?

Do we have real choices to make? We do.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you.

The Democrats have a substitute amendment that would replace the sequester in a different way. It would prevent the across-the-board cuts from happening to defense and the non-defense programs. So there's an agreement that that meat-ax approach is the wrong way. We have an alternative.

The gentleman just talked about how we have this great debate of ideas on the floor of the House. I have a very simple question: Why are we not going to get an up-or-down vote on our idea on how we would replace the sequester in a balanced way?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman both for his comments and for his offering of that substitute.

The reason is threefold:

Number one, that substitute doesn't comply with the rules of the House. We made a decision in this body that we were going to not continue to ask for more and more and more out of taxpayers' pockets but that we were going to try to do our own business here in terms of oversight on all the money that's already being borrowed and spent and sent out the door.

□ 0940

Number two, that happened to be the rules that we adopted in this Congress,

Mr. Speaker, but under the rules adopted in the last Congress in which you were the Budget chairman, you know your substitute would also not have been in order under the PAYGO rules that you instituted. Again, not a Republican or Democratic issue. Under a Republican House, the substitute is not in order. And under a Democratic House, the substitute is not in order.

But, number 3, and, I would argue, most importantly, I say to my friend, we've got a trust deficit with the American people, and it doesn't surprise me. When we talk about the 5-year impact of the reconciliation plan that we passed out of our Budget Committee and I hope that this House will pass today, we're talking about a net effect on debt reduction, the process for which reconciliation was created, of \$65 billion over 5 years. Over the next 5 years, \$65 billion is not going to have to be borrowed from our children and our grandchildren. Under the gentleman's substitute, over that same period of time, spending is actually going to go up by almost \$37 billion. This is a process that is designed to reduce borrowing and spending, to reduce the burden we are placing on our children, and the gentleman's substitute increases the burden that we place on our children.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't want to take up all your time, but I would like to make the point that what our substitute does is, dollar for dollar, replace the sequester, which is what our Republican colleagues have said is the object of this effort, which is to make sure that we don't have the meat-ax approach.

I would just note that the gentleman said that one of the reasons that we're not going to have an opportunity to vote on ours is because it doesn't comply exactly with the rules. In bringing the Republican bill to the floor today, I'm reading right here on the report, the committee report, you waived three rules. You waived three rules, and yet you can't allow an up-or-down vote on a substitute amendment. You know that you have it within the power to allow our substitute, just as you waived these three rules.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend, what we have within our power is the power to stop the borrowing and the spending. I'm reading here from today's Congressional Quarterly, because folks sometimes get confused, Mr. Speaker. We talked about the Reading Clerk and the tough work they had yesterday, reading today from Congressional Quarterly, it says here that Democrats left open the possibility that they would offer an alternative proposal through a motion to recommit, which is allowed under the rule. My friend on the Rules Committee knows that to be true. My friend on the Budget Committee knows that to be true.

I look forward to your using that opportunity to bring your substitute to the floor for a vote. I think that is the right of the minority. I'm glad we preserved the right of the minority, Mr. Speaker.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to reemphasize the point that Mr. VAN HOLLEN made.

You know, the Rules Committee has the right to be able to waive the rules to bring any piece of legislation to the floor. And as Mr. VAN HOLLEN rightly pointed out, in the report on this rule, the Republicans waive, implement waivers because their proposal, without these waivers, would violate the rules.

And so, you know, my friend talks about that this shouldn't be a partisan discussion. I would just say to my friend, the reason that this is a partisan discussion is because the Republicans have made it such by denying us the right to come to the floor and offer our substitute, not as a procedural matter, but as a real substitute. You have politicized this debate. You have shut us out, and that is why there is frustration.

And I just want to say one other thing again because I am so sick and tired of the demonization of programs that benefit poor people in this country, especially the SNAP program.

My friend was talking about all of this money that we invested in SNAP as if somehow we were giving these very generous benefits out. Just for the record, in 2002, the average SNAP benefit was \$1 per meal per day per person—\$1. With all of the improvements we have made, today it is about \$1.50 per meal per day; and it is going to go down next year because of cutbacks we've already made in this program, unfortunately, to offset other things over the past few years. That means in a 10-year period that we have increased this benefit by 50 cents per meal. Now, I don't know about my friend, but \$1.50 doesn't go very far today.

So when we're talking about trying to help people get through this economic crisis, that's what we're talking about. So this is not some extravagant, overly generous benefit. That's what it is. That's what it is. And rather than cutting waste in the Pentagon budget, which we all know exists, you protect the Pentagon budget. Rather than going after subsidies for oil companies and going after billionaire tax breaks, you protect all of that. And where do you go to find the savings? From programs that help the poorest of the poor. I mean, it's outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, and thank him for his leadership

on efforts to ensure that those families who are struggling most in our country continue to have access to food and nutrition, and that children in our country continue to have access to health care. And that's what this debate is all about, because we do have an alternative.

There is no disagreement on two things: Number one, we need to reduce our deficit in this country in a credible way; number two, the meat-ax approach of the sequester is not a smart way to do it.

So how should we go about reducing our deficit? Well, we propose to do it in the same balanced way that every bipartisan commission that has looked at this issue has recommended—through a combination of difficult cuts. And I would remind everybody that just last August we cut a trillion dollars through a combination of cuts as well as cuts to tax breaks for special interests and by asking the wealthiest people in this country, people who are making \$1 million a year, to contribute a little bit more toward deficit reduction.

Mr. WOODALL. Will my friend yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will yield very briefly, yes.

Mr. WOODALL. I have a very brief question.

My understanding of your substitute is that it raises \$3 in taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts. Could you tell me which bipartisan commissions have represented that, have also agreed that \$3 to \$1 is the right combination?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Absolutely. I'm glad the gentleman asked the question.

Simpson-Bowles, Rivlin-Domenici, they proposed an approach which was about \$3 in cuts to \$1 in revenue, depending on the accounting rules. We've already enacted \$1 trillion in cuts, 100 percent in cuts. You voted for that; I voted for that, 100 percent cuts.

What this does is, for the next 1 year, we do another \$30 billion in cuts—a little over that, actually—and then we get about \$80 billion through closing loopholes.

For example, we say that the big oil companies don't need taxpayer subsidies to encourage them to go drill. They've already testified, their chief executives, they don't need that. They're making plenty right now. We also say that millionaires should pay the same effective tax rate as the people who work for them.

And if you take that approach, frankly, with the trillion dollars in cuts we've already made, we are still cutting a lot more than the bipartisan groups recommended compared to the revenue. So our ratio of cuts to revenue is much higher because those bipartisan groups, they recommended that trillion dollars in cuts, and we adopted that on a bipartisan basis.

What they are not doing, what you're not doing, is taking the other part of their recommendation, frankly, which is to say let's close some of these outrageous tax loopholes for the purpose

of deficit reduction. And because 98 percent of our House Republican colleagues have signed this pledge saying that they won't take one penny of—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. You won't ask one penny more for people making over \$1 million a year to help reduce our deficit, not one penny. And the math is pretty simple after that; because you ask nothing of them, your budget whacks everyone else. That's why your budget ends the Medicare guarantee; that's why you cut \$800 billion out of Medicaid; and that's why, in your sequester proposal here, you whack programs that help the most vulnerable, struggling families.

Let's talk about what the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office said your proposal would do: 22 million households with children would see their food and nutrition support cut under the SNAP reductions; 300,000 kids will no longer get the school lunch program; 300,000 kids will lose their health coverage under the children's health insurance program. Those are the decisions you have to make because you don't want to ask the oil companies to give up their taxpayer subsidy.

We say the American people would make a different choice. We have that different choice in the substitute amendment. That substitute amendment would prevent those cuts to the Defense Department. It would prevent cuts to NIH and biomedical research. But it would prevent those cuts without whacking seniors and children's health programs. It would do it in a balanced way.

We say we don't need the direct payments to agricultural businesses. These are payments that go to ag businesses whether they're making money or not. The spigot is on. We cut those; you don't in your proposal that's before us today. Why not? Instead, you cut the food and nutrition programs.

So we think the right approach is the balanced approach that every bipartisan group that has gotten together has recommended.

□ 0950

Because 98 percent of our Republican colleagues have signed this pledge saying they're not going to ask the folks at the very top to put in one penny, one dime more, you're smacking everybody else. We don't think that's the right way to go. We agree we should reduce the deficit. And we eliminate the sequester, but just in a different way.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say we just disagree on what balance is. When our proposal for budget reduction is to reduce spending by \$65 billion over 5 years and your proposal for budget reduction is to spend an additional \$35 billion over those same 5 years, we disagree on what balance is. We are mov-

ing in the wrong direction under your proposal, right direction under our proposal. I'm very proud of our proposal, proud to serve on the committee with my friend.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to represent Selfridge Air National Guard Base, which is home to the Michigan Red Devils, the 107th Fighter Squadron.

The 107th, Mr. Speaker, flies A-10s, and they recently returned from a redeployment to Afghanistan where they performed so bravely and made us all proud. The 107th was one of the Air Guard units scheduled to be eliminated under the President's budget proposal, but fortunately the House Armed Services Committee will present a Defense reauthorization bill next week which reverses that and saves the 107th, along with protecting the Air National Guard actually across the entire country.

This House is going to do the right thing for the great American patriots of the Air National Guard by prioritizing spending within our budget, not by spending more money. So I would certainly urge our colleagues in the Senate to join us.

Mr. Speaker, we need to remember that the cuts that caused the Obama administration to target the Air Guard were before the sequester. If the sequester is allowed to go into effect, the impact on the community that I represent, for example, would be immense, and the defense corridor we are building as a part of our economic revitalization would be stopped, really, dead in its tracks. Not only would the National Guard again be put at risk of massive new cuts, but military contracting across the board would be faced with additional cuts. In Macomb County alone—the county that I'm proud to represent as part of my congressional district—this would mean \$200 million in additional cuts, Mr. Speaker, and obviously would cost countless jobs in the defense-related corridor.

This House has taken steps to stop the devastation of our Air National Guard and now is taking steps to stop the devastation of our defense base and needless loss of jobs with commonsense reforms. So I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting reconciliation today, and the Defense reauthorization bill that's coming to the floor next week.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm proud to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, which chooses to slash programs that help struggling families get back on their feet without closing a single tax loophole or eliminating a single special interest subsidy.

Our budget should reflect our values and, as many in the faith community have argued, it should advance the moral responsibilities of the Nation to provide for the common good. I note that the Catholic Bishops just sent a letter concluding that "the proposed cuts to programs in the Republican budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test." I'm pleased that the bishops are speaking out, as they should.

Forty percent of the total cuts here come from cutting assistance to low- and moderate-income families, including food stamps, Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and social services for vulnerable children and elderly and disabled people. But instead of eliminating big agricultural subsidies where people don't have to plant a seed and they get paid, this budget would cause more than 200,000 children to lose their school lunch and would cut the food stamp program by \$36 billion. That means 46 million Americans, one-half of whom are children, would see their benefits cut, and 2 million Americans would lose them entirely. This, at a time when one in seven seniors faces the threat of hunger and one in five children right here in America—a land of plenty—face a similar risk. They are going to bed hungry in the United States of America. We know the impact of hunger and malnutrition: lower performances at school, poor growth, and an immune system less able to fend off illness.

Instead of ending subsidies to big oil companies, this budget eliminates the Social Services Block Grant, which provides childcare assistance to low-income working mothers, addresses child abuse, and provides care for the elderly and disabled. About 23 million people, half of them children, would lose services.

Instead of ending tax breaks that allow corporations to ship jobs overseas, this budget cuts Medicaid, slashes the Children's Health Insurance Program, and forces 350,000 Americans to forego health care coverage provided by the health care reform.

Instead of asking millionaires to pay the same tax rates as middle class families, this budget makes children who are U.S. citizens but have immigrant parents ineligible for the child tax credit, harming 2 million families and 4.5 million children who are United States citizens. They end the Medicare guarantee for seniors in this Nation.

These cuts have a catastrophic effect on the most vulnerable in our Nation, and for what? All to protect special interest subsidies and tax breaks for the richest members of our society. My friends, it's \$150,000 for the average millionaire in a tax cut. That's what we're talking about in this piece of legislation. It is wrong. Budgets are about choices, about values. And this bill exposes exactly what this majority is all about.

We need to pass legislation that strengthens and rebuilds the middle

class of this country, creates jobs, invests in rebuilding our infrastructure, supports manufacturers, and restores fairness to our Tax Code. This reverse Robin Hood agenda of the House majority fails in every single regard, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, you know, when I hear my colleagues talk, it sounds as if we have a choice about doing one thing or another thing. I will say to my colleagues, when you're borrowing \$1.4 trillion a year from your children—

Ms. DELAURO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. Just a moment. I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

When you're borrowing \$1.4 trillion a year from your children, when you're mortgaging the future of this country, it's not a choice of either spending cuts or revenue changes; we've got to have both. We've got to have both. And to describe it to the American people as if we can do one or the other and get ourselves out of this mess, we cannot. We absolutely cannot. It takes both.

I would ask my friends—and with this, I'd be happy to yield to my colleague—when this House brought to the floor a tax cut bill that gave every Member of Congress a tax cut at the end of 2011 that said we only have to pay 4 percent of payroll taxes that we owe, instead of 6 percent of payroll taxes that we owe, I voted “no.” I said there's not a Member in this body that needs a tax cut. I said we have too big a problem in this Nation to give tax cuts to Members of Congress. I voted “no.” Did anybody else vote “no” with me? Did anybody else vote “no” with me?

I will not be lectured about how it is that tax cuts are distributed in this country when we have opportunities to cut them on this floor, to eliminate them on this floor, and my colleagues continue to vote “yes.” We could have added a provision that eliminated those tax cuts for the rich. We did not, and we should have.

With that, I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The fact of the matter is that there are choices, and the majority refuses to make those choices.

Let's not provide the tax cuts for people who are making over \$250,000 in this Nation. Let us pull back from Afghanistan in an orderly way and save the money. Let us cut the subsidies for those who are sending the jobs overseas.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my colleague, and I very much appreciate her passion—if I can get regular order, please, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia has the time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the Speaker for his help there. I'm sorry that I

needed it, but I appreciate him offering it.

You know, we passed a budget in this House, a comprehensive budget in this House. And to hear my colleagues talk, you'd think this is the only bill we're going to pass for the rest of the year. To hear my colleagues talk, you'd think we're not going to bring the farm bill to the floor and go after ag subsidies. To hear my colleagues talk, you'd think we're not going to bring a tax bill to the floor and try to raise revenues in this country. To hear my colleagues talk, this is it.

This isn't it. This is the bill that responds to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said in February of this year about the cuts that we're trying to prevent today:

I will tell you that I am prepared to say that sequestration will pose an unacceptable risk.

□ 1000

That's what we're here to talk about today: How do we mitigate the unacceptable risk? How do we mitigate against the challenges that former Democratic Budget Committee chairman, former Clinton OMB Director, former Clinton Chief of Staff, current Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta says threaten our national security?

And, again, we're going to have a choice, Mr. Speaker. We've brought a very powerful program, a very powerful proposal to the floor today, a very powerful proposal. For the first time in over a decade, we're trying to get a handle on that out-of-control portion of spending in this budget. Just a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Just a little bit.

And, again, we just have a different idea of what balance is. We have a different idea of what deficit reduction is. My idea of deficit reduction is over the next 5 years we reduce the deficit.

My colleagues' idea of deficit reduction is over the next 5 years we spend an additional \$40 billion above and beyond what we were going to borrow and spend anyway. It's a legitimate difference of opinion. I'm glad we're bringing this rule to the floor, Mr. Speaker, so that we can have a vote on that opinion. I look forward to the debate on the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

First of all, no one here on our side is arguing that sequestration should go into effect. We don't think that's good for our country, but we think that the Republican reconciliation bill is even worse for our country because of the cuts in so many programs that actually help our people.

There's no balance in there. The gentleman can say I'm all for balance. There's none in your reconciliation bill. It's all cuts to programs that actually help the people of this country.

And, finally, I'd just say we have an alternative to sequestration. Mr. VAN

HOLLEN brought that before the Rules Committee last night. The Rules Committee Republicans, every single one of them, voted “no.”

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think I'll let this thing cool down a little bit.

But the gentleman on the other side of this debate is quite wrong. There's no balance in this particular bill at all. There is no balance.

The cuts are devastating. Meals on Wheels for seniors, Medicare programs, Medicaid programs for seniors. And if you take a look at the rest of the issues, school lunch programs, kids are going to go hungry. There's no balance.

There is no tax proposal in this. There's no balance at all.

But the reason I rise today is to add one more problem that's not being solved by this reconciliation. The National Flood Insurance bill was folded in to this reconciliation, and it has a gaping hole. The Corps of Engineers has gone through the Nation's levees and downgraded those levees, creating an enormous problem for agriculture throughout this Nation, and certainly in California, where many of the levees have been downgraded. It's now impossible for farmers and the agricultural community to obtain loans to continue to produce and to enhance their agricultural production.

This amendment, which I had hoped could be put into the bill but was not allowed by the Rules Committee, would simply require an immediate study by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to undertake a study on the impact of the downgrading of the levees and the resultant inability to get national flood insurance, and the impact that that has on the agricultural communities, keeping in mind that agriculture, in a flood zone, is one of the very best ways to reduce the risk.

I would hope that the majority would consider, as this thing moves along, to fold into the National Flood Insurance Program an opportunity for the Farm Flood Program that I've introduced, which would allow farmers to obtain national flood insurance, and then the lending that the banks could make available so they can continue to build the necessary facilities for their agricultural production.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there are no tough choices here. I talked to the gentleman whose seat I took the other day. I said, John, you know, when you were up here as a Congressman, you made it look fun. Folks were always saying thank you, thank you, thank you for all the spending that was going on here. I said, I don't get to make any fun decisions.

When you've increased the public debt in this country by 50 percent over the last 4 years, you're all out of give-away decisions. All we have now are tough decisions. That's all we have.

And, again, I know that my friend from Massachusetts speaks with passion and conviction. His advocacy for

the neediest among us is an inspiration on the floor and in committee and on and on, and I don't fault him for that a bit.

But I would say to my friend, had we not given that payroll tax cut to Members of Congress, we could have provided that food stamp increase that you discussed earlier to an additional 2 million individuals in this country, an additional 2 million individuals in this country had we foregone that tax increase right here. But we didn't. We chose just to go along with the program and cut away, spend away. We can't do that. We've got to stop that.

And I would say to my friend, because it's hard, I have the same families struggling in my district that you do. In fact, our foreclosure rate in my district is higher than it is in your district. Our number of folks who are going homeless in Georgia as a result of foreclosures, higher than it is in Massachusetts.

But when you talk about the additional 1.8 million folks, 1.8 million folks, Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO, who are going to lose their food stamp benefits under this bill, there's no question about that.

But here's the thing, Mr. Speaker, and this is important. This bill doesn't cut anybody from food stamps. This bill says the only people who can get food stamps are people who apply and qualify for food stamps. Hear that, Mr. Speaker.

The CBO tells us, and my friend from Massachusetts quotes, that 1.8 million people are going to lose food stamp benefits. But the only change this bill makes is that you actually have to apply for the benefits to get the benefits. So that means 1.8 million people in this country are receiving food stamp benefits who would not qualify for food stamp benefits if they had to go and apply.

Mr. Speaker, that is not mean-spirited. If you want to change the food stamp rules, if you want to make it a laxer process, whatever you want to do, let's do that. But let's not demonize each other. Let's not say we're trying to throw poor children out in the streets, when all we're saying is we have a successful food stamp program, and why don't we just limit it to those people who qualify for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for the courtesy of yielding.

The fact of the matter is that 1.8 million people will not be able to get the supplemental food that they get from food stamps. They're going to be hungry. That's a fact.

Now, the rest of the fact is the application process has been supported by the Federal Government and by the legislation so that the States can reach out to those people that are hungry and that are able to qualify for food stamps. That's gone in this bill. So the

ability to reach out and to bring into those programs—

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, I would say reaching out and bringing folks into the program who do not qualify for the program. The rules for the program are clear, Mr. Speaker. If you qualify for food stamps, I am the first one who wants you to have it. If you qualify for the SNAP program, under SNAP program rules, you should get food stamps.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'll be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Just so the gentleman understands, the General Accountability Office says the error rate in the SNAP program is less than 3 percent. What is he talking about when people are getting benefits that they don't deserve? I'd like to know the numbers of that. How much?

Mr. WOODALL. This is important, Mr. Speaker, and I hope folks are paying attention back in their offices. The gentleman is talking about the error rate, the error rate, folks who have mistakenly gotten food stamps because in the application process they got the application process wrong. They shouldn't have qualified but they have given them away anyway.

What the CBO says is something entirely different. What the CBO says is that 1.8 million American families, if they walked into the office today and applied for food stamps today, would not qualify for food stamps. It's not an error. It's not a mistake. It's that the rules of the game have been changed to say we just want everybody, we just want everybody to have a part in the program.

When the gentleman says it's a paperwork nightmare for States, I happen to agree with the gentleman. There's a tremendous paperwork challenge for States. But this does not solve that. All we're saying is go through the application process. To suggest that we're trying to take benefits away from people who need those benefits is disingenuous.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to let the gentleman have his own time, Mr. Speaker, because I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Just by way of time update, the gentleman from Georgia has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman is wrong. He's just wrong when he talks about the abuse of the SNAP program, that people are somehow getting benefits that they're not entitled to. And the demagoguery that's going on with regard to categorical eligibility is just inexcusable. That actually cuts paperwork and bureaucracy at a State level, and it helps people who are eligible to get the benefits.

I'd also say to the gentleman, he gets up on the floor and talks about this payroll tax cut for Members of Congress. That was a payroll tax cut for everybody.

□ 1010

Now, if you wanted to exempt Members of Congress, that would be minuscule. That would do nothing to provide any benefit to anyone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that I wish he would show me the code sections here that go into the SNAP program, the codes that say, under the SNAP program, the income criteria that we had yesterday is changing, and so folks aren't going to get those benefits tomorrow. That's not here. All this bill does is to say you need to apply, and you need to earn those benefits on your own merits.

When the gentleman talks about paperwork, he knows good and well the CBO took that into consideration. When the CBO says 1.8 million families are no longer going to qualify, it means some folks are going to get thrown off of categorical eligibility because that is the gaming of the system. They're going to go back in, and they're going to apply for benefits, and they're going to get them, but 1.8 million are going to go back in and apply and get denied because they don't qualify for benefits.

Mr. Speaker, if we need to change the eligibility criteria, if we have folks in need who can't qualify, let's change the eligibility criteria. But in the name of good government, when we're going into programs and saying we have rules of the game—we just want people to have to follow them—to somehow define that as being mean-spirited, it galls me.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

What galls me is that the Republican majority is balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in this country, on the poorest of the poor.

The gentleman talks about the CBO. The CBO says that cutting \$36 billion from the SNAP program means that more than 22 million households will see a cut in their benefits. It means that 22 million families will have less food tomorrow than they do today. In fact, 2 million people would be cut from SNAP altogether. That is not my making up numbers. That's the CBO. That's where I get that from. I think that's cruel and inhumane during one of the worst economic crises that we've faced.

Yes, we have to balance the budget, and we have to make tough choices, but why does it have to be on the backs of the most vulnerable? Why can't Donald Trump pay a couple of more dollars in taxes? Why can't we end the subsidies to Big Oil? Why can't we make it so that Warren Buffett pays the same tax rate as his secretary? That's all we're saying here.

Your reconciliation bill represents your priorities. What we're arguing is that your priorities are wrong and bad for the country. We have an alternative. You won't even let us have the opportunity to debate that alternative on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts that I am prepared to close if he has anymore speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm it.

Mr. WOODALL. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this closed rule to let the House work its will and to give Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute an up-or-down vote in the House. It deserves more than a procedural vote.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think what we're talking about here today are two different visions for this country. The Republicans have their vision that is outlined in their reconciliation package. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I think, has adequately summarized what the Democratic priorities are.

The main difference is that, in their proposal, there is no balance. It's a meat-ax approach to everything—cut, cut, cut, cut—regardless of what it means to the people of this country. What we're trying to do and, quite frankly, what other bipartisan commissions have recommended, is a more balanced approach: we cut spending, but there are also some revenues to be raised.

At a time in our country when we have a Tax Code that allows Warren Buffett to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary, it seems that it's time for a little fairness, and that's all we're asking for here. That's all we're asking for—a balanced, fair approach. We are prepared to make the tough choices. Yes, some of those tough choices mean cuts. But I'd say to the Republicans that some of those tough choices may mean you'll have to go back on the pledge that you signed with Grover Norquist, that you'll have to support closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on the wealthiest individuals in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to insert in the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and I want to read one paragraph from that letter, which is to the Members of Congress:

The Catholic bishops of the United States recognize the serious deficits our country faces, and we acknowledge that Congress

must make difficult decisions about how to allocate burdens and sacrifices and balance resources and needs. However, deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility efforts must protect and not undermine the needs of poor and vulnerable people. The proposed cuts to programs in the budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test. The catechism of the Catholic Church states it is the proper role of government to "make accessible to each what is needed to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, suitable information, the right to establish a family, and so on." Poor and vulnerable people do not have powerful lobbyists to advocate their interests, but they have the most compelling needs.

Mr. Speaker, that paragraph sums up what I feel and what so many of us feel about what my friends on the other side of the aisle are doing. Yes, we have to make tough choices, but why are always the tough choices on the backs of middle-income families and on the backs of the poor?

There are people in this country who are hungry. We are the richest country on the planet, and we have hungry people here. Yet what is our response? It's not to figure out a way to help deal with this terrible scourge. Our response—their response—is to take a meat-ax approach to SNAP, which will cut benefits. That's what the CBO says, that it will cut benefits and that people will have less food tomorrow than they have today if this is to become law.

I think that's a horrible choice. That's not a choice we should be discussing on the floor. Yes, let's make these programs more efficient. But I'm going to tell you the SNAP Program is a hell of a lot more efficient than the Pentagon—the waste, the fraud, and the abuse in the Pentagon, the wasteful weapons systems in the Pentagon. I want to tell you that I don't care what Leon Panetta says. There are savings to be found in the Pentagon's budget, and we ought to go after that. We ought to make sure that Donald Trump pays his fair share in taxes, and we ought to close these corporate tax loopholes that allow corporations to get away with paying no taxes. Middle-income families can't do that.

This is about fairness. That's what we're looking for—fairness and balance. This is a tough time. But rather than following the European model—which my friends seem to love, a model of austerity and of cut, cut, cut, cut, which is not very popular, as they're seeing—what we're trying to do here is to make responsible cutbacks and responsible investments: investing in a robust highway bill to put people back to work, investing in education to make sure our young people are prepared to compete in the 21st century economy, and, yes, investing in the social safety net and investing in programs that provide a circle of protection to the poor and the most vulnerable.

There is nothing wrong with that. We should be proud of the fact that we are a country that cares. Let's not give that up. That's a strength. It's not a weakness. It's a strength. I say to my

colleagues that my biggest problem with what the Republicans are doing is that it fails that test. What it does is it goes after the most vulnerable in a way that, I think, is cruel and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, DC, May 8, 2012.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you vote on a reconciliation package for the fiscal year 2013 budget, I would like to affirm the principle contained in the Committee Report that the "budget starts with the proposition that first, Congress must do no harm." In this light, I urge you to ensure all policies meet the moral criteria established by the Catholic bishops of the United States to create a circle of protection around programs that serve poor and vulnerable people and communities:

1. Every budget decision should be assessed by whether it protects or threatens human life and dignity.

2. A central moral measure of any budget proposal is how it affects the lives and dignity of "the least of these" (Matthew 25). The needs of those who are hungry and homeless, without work or in poverty should come first.

3. Government and other institutions have a shared responsibility to promote the common good of all, especially ordinary workers and families who struggle to live in dignity in difficult economic times.

A just framework for future budgets cannot rely on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor persons; it requires shared sacrifice by all, including raising adequate revenues, eliminating unnecessary military and other spending, and addressing the long-term costs of health insurance and retirement programs fairly.

I reiterate our strong opposition to an unfair proposal that would alter the Child Tax Credit to exclude children of hard-working, immigrant families. The bishops' conference has long supported the Child Tax Credit because it is pro-work, pro-family, and one of the most effective antipoverty programs in our nation. Denying the credit to children of working poor immigrant families—the large majority of whom are American citizens—would hurt vulnerable kids, increase poverty, and would not advance the common good.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps), provides vital food security to families during tough economic times. It is estimated that cuts proposed in this bill would deny assistance to two million families, and cut the benefit for everyone else. No poor family that receives food assistance would be unaffected, constituting a direct threat to their human dignity. If savings in agricultural programs need to be achieved, subsidies and direct payments can be reduced and targeted to small and moderate-sized farms.

The Social Services Block Grant is an important source of funding for programs throughout the country that serve vulnerable members of our communities—the homeless, the elderly, people with disabilities, children living in poverty, and abuse victims. We should prioritize programs that serve "the least of these," not eliminate them.

The Catholic bishops of the United States recognize the serious deficits our country

faces, and we acknowledge that Congress must make difficult decisions about how to allocate burdens and sacrifices and balance resources and needs. However, deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility efforts must protect and not undermine the needs of poor and vulnerable people. The proposed cuts to programs in the budget reconciliation fail this basic moral test. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states it is the proper role of government to "make accessible to each what is needed to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, suitable information, the right to establish a family, and so on" (no. 1908). Poor and vulnerable people do not have powerful lobbyists to advocate their interests, but they have the most compelling needs.

As you pursue responsible deficit reduction, the Catholic bishops join other faith leaders and people of good will urging you to protect the lives and dignity of poor and vulnerable families by putting a circle of protection around these essential programs and to refrain from cutting programs that serve them.

Sincerely,
Most Reverend STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
*Chairman, Committee on Domestic Justice
and Human Development.*

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for joining me on the floor today.

I will say I think he chose exactly the right words when he was trying to make his points: describe your opposition as hating women and children, and that's your best chance of winning your argument. If only it were true.

And that's what I hope the American people take home from debates like these, Mr. Speaker—that there are serious challenges here and that there are serious people who are here who are trying to solve these challenges. But we get wrapped around the axle in the name-calling I hear, that I would argue does nothing to feed a child and that does nothing to take care of a family.

The gentleman says that we're the richest Nation in the world. I would tell the gentleman there is no poorer nation on the planet. There is not a nation on the planet that has borrowed more money than this Nation has—not one, not one. What do they say about socialism, Mr. Speaker? It's a great plan until you run out of other people's money. Guess what? We've run out of other people's money.

I just want to show you a chart, Mr. Speaker. This is a chart—and I'll show it so that other Members can see it. The green line represents tax revenues in this country. It goes back to 1947. What you'll see is that tax revenues are fairly flat as a percent of the economy. In fact, because this chart goes all the way back to 1947, it reflects the New Deal with FDR. It reflects all of that growth in government. The red line is the government spending. It goes all the way back through 1965. It reflects Lyndon Johnson and all the Great Society spending that goes on.

I just want to make sure all of my colleagues can see it there. The red line represents where spending is going in this Nation, and the green line represents where taxes are historically in this Nation. Mr. Speaker, does this

look like we have a tax problem here? Does it look like we have a spending problem in this Nation?

□ 1020

Taxes have remained the same as a percentage of GDP, as has spending, until now. Until now, we have a spending-driven crisis in this Nation. I say to my friend that, again, he chose all the right talking points: they want to protect the rich; they want to protect the oil companies.

There is one bill in this Congress that you know well, Mr. Speaker, that eliminates every single corporate loophole exemption deduction and break. There's one. That same bill, Mr. Speaker, eliminates every loophole the wealthy use to avoid paying their fair share. Mr. Speaker, it is the single most popularly cosponsored tax bill, fundamental reform bill in the House and in the Senate. It has almost 70 Members in the House; it has nine Members in the Senate, and there is one Democrat on it.

Mr. Speaker, giving the right speech down here about what folks ought to do doesn't move us in the right direction. Putting your name behind some legislation and moving something forward gets us in the right direction. This Budget Committee chairman sitting here beside me, I'm so proud of him. Chairman PAUL RYAN, that's a man known around this country as a man who is trying.

There are a lot of folks here who are known for blaming. There aren't many folks who are known for trying, who say, I don't care about the slings and the arrows. America is facing crisis. And if not me, then who?

We got that in the House-passed budget, Mr. Speaker, folks who said, If not me, then who? And they made tough choices. Here we have the first reconciliation bill. My colleagues on the other side are going to offer a motion to recommit to this deficit-reduction bill that actually increases spending and call that balance.

Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program spending has increased 270 percent over the last decade. The mean-spirited folks that my colleagues talk about want to increase it by 260 percent instead. These aren't easy decisions, Mr. Speaker, but they're not going to put one family out that qualifies for food stamps.

We're going to move beyond the demagoguery, Mr. Speaker. We're going to move into the real business that governing this Nation takes. I hope we'll get a strong bipartisan vote on this rule. I hope we'll get a strong bipartisan vote on the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of both the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 648 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike "and (2)" and insert "(2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted for printing in the Congressional

Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3)".

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—237

Adams	Duffy	Kelly
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Akin	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Alexander	Ellmers	Kingston
Amash	Emerson	Kinzing (IL)
Amodei	Farenthold	Kissell
Austria	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Flake	Lamborn
Barletta	Fleischmann	Lance
Bartlett	Fleming	Landry
Barton (TX)	Flores	Lankford
Bass (NH)	Forbes	Latham
Benishke	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Berg	Fox	Latta
Biggart	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Gallely	Long
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Lucas
Black	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Gerlach	Lummis
Bonner	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Bono Mack	Gibson	E.
Boren	Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo
Boustany	Gohmert	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Marino
Brooks	Gosar	Matheson
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McCotter
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Calvert	Grimm	McKeon
Camp	Guinta	McKinley
Campbell	Guthrie	McMorris
Canseco	Hall	Rodgers
Cantor	Hanna	Meehan
Capito	Harper	Mica
Carter	Harris	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Chaffetz	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Coble	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Coffman (CO)	Hensarling	Myrick
Cole	Herger	Neugebauer
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Nunes
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Olson
Culberson	Hunter	Palazzo
Davis (KY)	Issa	Paulsen
Denham	Jenkins	Pearce
Dent	Johnson (IL)	Pence
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Dold	Jones	Platts
Dreier	Jordan	Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Royce
Posey	Runyan
Price (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Quayle	Scalise
Reed	Schilling
Rehberg	Schmidt
Reichert	Schock
Renacci	Schweikert
Ribble	Scott (SC)
Rigell	Scott, Austin
Rivera	Sensenbrenner
Roby	Sessions
Roe (TN)	Shimkus
Rogers (AL)	Shuster
Rogers (KY)	Simpson
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)
Rokita	Smith (TX)
Rooney	Southerland
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Roskam	Stivers
Ross (AR)	Sullivan
Ross (FL)	Terry

NAYS—177

Ackerman	Frank (MA)
Altmire	Fudge
Andrews	Garamendi
Baca	Gonzalez
Baldwin	Green, Al
Barrow	Green, Gene
Bass (CA)	Grijalva
Becerra	Gutierrez
Berkley	Hahn
Berman	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Heinrich
Blumenauer	Higgins
Bonamici	Himes
Boswell	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Hirono
Braley (IA)	Hochul
Brown (FL)	Holden
Butterfield	Holt
Capps	Honda
Capuano	Hoyer
Cardoza	Israel
Carman	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	(TX)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Chandler	Kaptur
Chu	Keating
Cicilline	Kildee
Clarke (MI)	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Lee (CA)
Connolly (VA)	Levin
Conyers	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski
Costa	Loebuck
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowe
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Maloney
Cuellar	Markey
Cummings	Matsui
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (IL)	McCollum
DeFazio	McDermott
DeGette	McGovern
DeLauro	McNerney
Deutsch	Meeks
Dingell	Michaud
Doggett	Miller (NC)
Doyle	Miller, George
Edwards	Moore
Ellison	Moran
Engel	Murphy (CT)
Eshoo	Nadler
Farr	Napolitano
Fattah	Neal

NOT VOTING—17

Burgess	Hurt
Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch
Finer	Mack
Granger	McCauley
Hinchey	Noem

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Mr. KISSELL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 244, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 648. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 244, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 233, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—233

Adams	Farenthold	Kinzing (IL)
Aderholt	Fincher	Kline
Akin	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Alexander	Flake	Lamborn
Amash	Fleischmann	Lance
Amodei	Fleming	Landry
Bachmann	Flores	Lankford
Barletta	Forbes	Latham
Bartlett	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Barton (TX)	Fox	Latta
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Benishke	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Berg	Gallely	Long
Biggart	Gardner	Lucas
Bilbray	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Gerlach	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Black	Gibson	E.
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo
Bonner	Gohmert	Marchant
Bono Mack	Goodlatte	Marino
Boustany	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	McCauley
Brooks	Granger	McClintock
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McCotter
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Calvert	Grimm	McMorris
Camp	Guinta	Rodgers
Campbell	Guthrie	Meehan
Canseco	Hall	Mica
Cantor	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Capito	Harper	Miller (MI)
Carter	Harris	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Hayworth	Myrick
Coble	Heck	Neugebauer
Coffman (CO)	Hensarling	Nugent
Cole	Herger	Nunes
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Olson
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Paulsen
Culberson	Hunter	Pearce
Davis (KY)	Issa	Pence
Denham	Jenkins	Petri
Dent	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Platts
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Dold	Jones	Pompeo
Dreier	Jordan	Posey
	Kelly	Price (GA)
	King (IA)	Quayle
	King (NY)	Rehberg
	Kingston	Reichert

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt

NOES—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—15

Austria
Bachus
Berman
Broun (GA)
Burgess

Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Hinches
Johnson (GA)
Mack

Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 245, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2224. An act to require the President to report to Congress on issues related to Syria.

SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 648, I call up the bill (H.R. 5652) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 648, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-21 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5652

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURE

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. ARRA sunset at June 30, 2012.

Sec. 103. Categorical eligibility limited to cash assistance.

Sec. 104. Standard utility allowances based on the receipt of energy assistance payments.

Sec. 105. Employment and training; workfare.

Sec. 106. End State bonus program for the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

Sec. 107. Funding of employment and training programs.

Sec. 108. Turn off indexing for nutrition education and obesity prevention.

Sec. 109. Extension of Authorization of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

Sec. 110. Effective dates and application of amendments.

TITLE II—COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain ACA Funding Provisions

Sec. 201. Repealing mandatory funding to states to establish American Health Benefit Exchanges.

Sec. 202. Repealing Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Sec. 203. Rescinding unobligated balances for CO-OP program.

Subtitle B—Medicaid

Sec. 211. Revision of provider tax indirect guarantee threshold.

Sec. 212. Rebasement of State DSH allotments for fiscal year 2022.

Sec. 213. Repeal of Medicaid and CHIP maintenance of effort requirements under PPACA.

Sec. 214. Medicaid payments to territories.

Sec. 215. Repealing bonus payments for enrollment under Medicaid and CHIP.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL SERVICES

Sec. 301. Table of contents.

Subtitle A—Orderly Liquidation Fund

Sec. 311. Repeal of liquidation authority.

Subtitle B—Home Affordable Modification Program

Sec. 321. Short title.

Sec. 322. Congressional findings.

Sec. 323. Termination of authority.

Sec. 324. Sense of Congress.

Subtitle C—Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

Sec. 331. Bringing the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process.

Subtitle D—Flood Insurance Reform

Sec. 341. Short title.

Sec. 342. Extensions.

Sec. 343. Mandatory purchase.

Sec. 344. Reforms of coverage terms.

Sec. 345. Reforms of premium rates.

Sec. 346. Technical Mapping Advisory Council.

Sec. 347. FEMA incorporation of new mapping protocols.

Sec. 348. Treatment of levees.

Sec. 349. Privatization initiatives.

Sec. 350. FEMA annual report on insurance program.

Sec. 351. Mitigation assistance.

Sec. 352. Notification to homeowners regarding mandatory purchase requirement applicability and rate phase-ins.

Sec. 353. Notification to members of congress of flood map revisions and updates.

Sec. 354. Notification and appeal of map changes; notification to communities of establishment of flood elevations.

Sec. 355. Notification to tenants of availability of contents insurance.

Sec. 356. Notification to policy holders regarding direct management of policy by FEMA.

Sec. 357. Notice of availability of flood insurance and escrow in RESPA good faith estimate.

Sec. 358. Reimbursement for costs incurred by homeowners and communities obtaining letters of map amendment or revision.

Sec. 359. Enhanced communication with certain communities during map updating process.

Sec. 360. Notification to residents newly included in flood hazard areas.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.