

Hall	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Hanabusa	McGovern	Ryan (WI)
Hanna	McHenry	Salmon
Harper	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda
Harris	McKeon	T.
Hartzler	McKinley	Sanchez, Loretta
Hastings (FL)	McMorris	Sarbanes
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Scalise
Heck (NV)	McNerney	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	Meadows	Schiff
Hensarling	Meehan	Schneider
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Schock
Higgins	Meng	Schwartz
Himes	Messer	Schweikert
Hinojosa	Mica	Scott (VA)
Holding	Michaud	Scott, Austin
Holt	Miller (FL)	Scott, David
Honda	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Horsford	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sessions
Hudson	Moore	Sewell (AL)
Huelskamp	Moran	Shea-Porter
Huffman	Mullin	Sherman
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Shimkus
Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Shuster
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Hurt	Nadler	Sinema
Israel	Napolitano	Sires
Issa	Neal	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod	Smith (NE)
Jeffries	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Noem	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nugent	Southerland
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Speier
Jordan	Nunnelee	Stewart
Joyce	O'Rourke	Stivers
Kaptur	Olson	Stockman
Keating	Owens	Stutzman
Kelly	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Takano
Kildee	Pascarella	Terry
Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Paulsen	Thompson (MS)
King (IA)	Payne	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Pearce	Thornberry
Kingston	Pelosi	Tiberi
Kinzinger (IL)	Perlmutter	Tierney
Kirkpatrick	Perry	Tipton
Kline	Peters (CA)	Titus
Kuster	Peters (MI)	Tonko
Labrador	Peterson	Tsongas
LaMalfa	Petri	Turner
Lamborn	Pingree (ME)	Upton
Lance	Pittenger	Valadao
Langevin	Pitts	Van Hollen
Lankford	Pocan	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Poe (TX)	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Polis	Vela
Latham	Pompeo	Velázquez
Latta	Posey	Visclosky
Lee (CA)	Price (GA)	Wagner
Levin	Price (NC)	Walberg
Lewis	Quigley	Walden
Lipinski	Radel	Walorski
LoBiondo	Rahall	Walz
Loebsock	Rangel	Wasserman
Lofgren	Reed	Schultz
Long	Reichert	Waters
Lowenthal	Renacci	Watt
Lowey	Ribble	Waxman
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Webster (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Rigell	Welch
(NM)	Roby	Wenstrup
Luján, Ben Ray	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Williams
Maffei	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Carolyn	Rokita	Wittman
Maloney, Sean	Rooney	Wolf
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
Marino	Roskam	Woodall
Massie	Ross	Yarmuth
Matheson	Rothfus	Yoder
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Yoho
McCarthy (CA)	Royce	Young (AK)
McCarthy (NY)	Ruiz	Young (FL)
McCauley	Runyan	Young (IN)
McClintock	Ruppersberger	
McColum	Rush	

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann	Costa	Lynch
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Markey
Coble	Jones	Schrader

□ 1759

Mr. OLSON changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOERBIGER CORPORATION OF AMERICA—50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 9, Hoerbiger Corporation of America will celebrate its 50th anniversary. A well-known and highly respected south Florida-based company, Hoerbiger provides many hardworking Americans with high quality manufacturing jobs in our south Florida community.

I commend this innovative corporation for its half decade of business prowess, its commitment to sustainable businesses practices, its fairness to its employees and generosity to our community.

Since 1963, Hoerbiger's focus on quality and innovation has established it as an industry leader, much to the credit of its founder, Hubert Wagner. The legacy of success continues with the expert guidance of its current president, Hannes Hunschofsky.

This exemplary corporation and community partner has accomplished much over the years, and I am pleased that it calls south Florida home. Congratulations to each and every one at Hoerbiger for achieving this exciting milestone, and I wish you many more years of success.

A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the only way to get our economy growing stronger is to take an honest account of the fiscal problems we face and put forward serious policies to address these challenges—it is called budgeting.

A fundamental part of governing entails writing and passing a budget, something we have not seen from the Senate Chamber in over 4 years. Four years, that's how long my constituents and Americans across this country have had to wait for the Senate to perform its most basic function as a legislative body.

Before today, the only thing certain was that the Senate would not consider a budget. Today, the Senate Democrats introduced a budget, and I'm glad they did. It's about time. Unfortunately, after reviewing their proposal, today the only thing certain is that their budget will never balance.

We owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget. The House

budget introduced yesterday balances the budget in 10 years. The Senate Democrats' proposal never balances—ever.

A balanced budget will foster a healthier economy and create jobs, Madam Speaker. The American people elected us to lead and put forward solutions, not hide from challenges and posture for the next election.

CONGRATULATING MARS, INCORPORATED

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mars, Incorporated for being recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the “best companies to work for.”

Many folks are familiar with the Mars' delicious snacks, such as M&Ms and Snickers. In my home State of Georgia, we have come to know Mars as a great place to work through its merger with Wrigley.

Since joining the Mars family in 2008, employees at the Wrigley manufacturing plant in Flowery Branch, Georgia, have benefited from being part of the Mars community. Mars employees are given wonderful opportunities for growth and advancement. As a result, the company boasts a low turnover rate.

Mars' strategies have resulted in diversity that strengthens its business model by mentorship opportunities which are built into the company's structure, including a “reverse internship” in which a younger employee introduces an executive to social media.

Like Wrigley, Mars is truly an American success story. Mars remains a family-owned company that places high value on its human capital, which it demonstrates through significant investment in its 72,000 employees.

Through innovation and creativity, Wrigley continues to identify new markets and growth opportunities, such their new Alert chewing gum line.

I want to congratulate the hardworking Mars workforce throughout the United States, and especially the Wrigley employees in Georgia, for building a great company. The millions of Americans who enjoy Juicy Fruit, Life Savers, and your other wonderful products wish you continued success.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this week, the House Budget Committee chair, PAUL RYAN, laid out his budget plan. Sadly, it's just more of the same. Like a bad

record, this year's Republican proposal is virtually the same document as the one he proposed last spring. It harms the middle class. It harms low-income Americans, and it is especially bad for women and families.

Now they have framed this budget and called it a prosperity one, a prosperity plan. But this budget should be called "the road to austerity," because it is a plan that is most noteworthy for the rather harsh austerity it demands of the many and the lavish benefits it extends to the few. It clearly envisions a rising tide of selective tax cuts that would lift all yachts but leave many dinghies behind.

Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few. That's their plan.

Now, specifically under this plan, he has this new goal of balancing the budget in 10 years. To accomplish this, he slashes funding safety net programs that serve seniors, students, children, low-income families, and women. The budget slashes food stamps and cuts funding for infrastructure investments like high-speed rail. We're falling way behind the rest of the world. We need to invest in our infrastructure to stay competitive. And it does nothing for job creation or to help the unemployed.

The Ryan plan replaces Medicare, and really ends Medicare as we know it by replacing it with a voucher system and replaces Medicaid by making it a block grant to the States. These cuts hurt tens of millions of Americans who count on these programs for their health care coverage.

But not to just rely on what I'm saying, to quote The Washington Post:

The 10-year spending plan released Tuesday by Representative Ryan is virtually identical to last year's GOP budget. It would defund President Obama's health care initiative and guaranteed Medicare coverage for future retirees and sharply restrain spending on the poor, college students and Federal workers.

Now, what I find very hypocritical about this budget is that they say that they are going to repeal ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, yet this bill passed this Congress. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where this was the issue that people ran on, and President Obama was reelected, strongly. So they keep flip-flopping on this issue. They say they want to abolish ObamaCare, but then they rely on the savings of over \$700 million in that program.

So when Congressman RYAN was Vice Presidential candidate Ryan, he campaigned against the health care provider cuts of \$716 million, the same ones he wants to keep in this budget. The Republicans opposed these cuts when they were part of the Affordable Care Act, then they passed two budgets that included these cuts. And then Congressman RYAN and Presidential

candidate Romney campaigned against the cuts in the 2012 election. And now Mr. RYAN wants to keep them, once again. That's not just a 180-degree turn, it's 180 degrees times four, so it's a change of 720 degrees.

But one thing that is completely clear in this budget is that women, in particular, will suffer because of the choices the Republican budget makes.

□ 1810

Instead of closing tax loopholes for companies that ship jobs overseas, the budget kicks kids out of Head Start. Instead of getting rid of tax breaks for the oil and gas industry, for single moms struggling to put food on the table it cuts food stamps.

It seems to me with the budget right now that we are spending at a roughly proposed 3.1 percent, but 1.1 percent is tax loopholes. If you just closed those tax loopholes, you would be able to significantly reduce the deficit and the debt. Why in the world are we giving tax loopholes for companies that move jobs overseas? If you're going to give a tax incentive, it should be to the companies that stay in America and create jobs for Americans.

Now, instead of ensuring that women are not discriminated against by health insurance companies, this bill would repeal the rights women earned in the Affordable Care Act. The Republican budget cuts Medicare benefits, cuts Medicaid services, cuts health research funding and so much more all in the name of a new agenda that they have that will cripple our economy and cause real and lasting harm to the women of America.

The Democratic approach is a more balanced one. Everyone agrees that we need to reduce the deficit and cut the debt, but it's a matter of how you do it, what priorities you have in it and what's your timeframe. The Democratic plan is balanced. I would call it a three-legged stool. You have cuts, you have revenues and you have investments to help grow and expand the economy and create jobs, investments in education and innovation.

Chairman Bernanke has testified before Congress that many of the reasons why America is really digging its way out of this recession and bouncing back faster and stronger than Europe is that we have had a balanced approach, whereas Europe has had an austerity, austerity, austerity approach. As many economists say, "You cannot cut your way to prosperity." Austerity needs to be balanced with revenues and also investments.

I'm joined tonight by DINA TITUS from the great State of Nevada. She was reelected in this session. She was an outstanding member of our caucus. We are so thrilled that she's come back to join us.

I yield the gentlelady as much time as she may consume.

Ms. TITUS. Thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, for letting me join you tonight, and thank you for orga-

nizing this very important special hour to talk about the Republican budget and its unacceptable impact on women.

For the third year in a row, Chairman RYAN has proposed an uncompromising budget plan that is out of touch with my State of Nevada's priorities and the country's vision for the future.

Chairman RYAN has used a lot of gimmicks in his budget, but no amount of chicanery will hide what this budget really means for women.

Instead of laying out a fair and balanced plan, as you said, Congresswoman, Representative RYAN's budget undermines the health and economic security of the elderly and the disabled, most of whom are women, and disproportionately harms low-income women and families they struggle to support.

It also would repeal the Affordable Care Act. This landmark legislation that we passed increases access to critical women's health services such as prenatal and maternity care, and it finally ends the longstanding notion that being a woman is a preexisting condition.

The proposed budget also threatens a laundry list of vital programs that help women and children such as SNAP, WIC, Head Start, school lunches, TANF, and Pell Grants, just to name a few. These are programs that millions of women across the country and their families rely on every day just to get by.

Instead of protecting such critical programs, Representative RYAN and the Republican Party would rather protect tax breaks for the wealthiest folks in our country, for oil companies and for those companies you mentioned that ship our jobs overseas.

The Federal budget is a blueprint for our Nation's future. It's a statement of our national priorities. It should reflect who we are, and it should provide a path forward that we can all be proud of.

My constituents in Las Vegas and our constituents around the country deserve better than this old rehearsed Ryan budget which slashes programs for children, dismantles health care for women, eliminates the safety net for seniors and defunds education and needed research and development that we should be investing in as part of that three-legged stool.

Instead, we need to get to work on a balanced plan that protects women and families and makes those needed investments in our future.

Again, I thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, and our colleagues who have joined us tonight to talk about these important issues, and I urge you to give careful consideration to the Ryan budget with all those hidden little tricks and old hat policies.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank you for joining us tonight to share how this impacts on Nevada, an important State that you're representing. And I just want to express my gratitude that you have come

back to Congress and that you're a part of our caucus.

Another outstanding woman in our caucus is CAROL SHEA-PORTER from the great State of New Hampshire. And it is a State that's really unusual now in that all of its elected officials are women: the Governor, the legislature, the State and the assembly. We're so pleased that their Congresswoman is here today, and I know she has a special message from the great State of New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, for the chance to speak about the damage that the Ryan budget would do to women and to families.

There are a couple of points. The new Ryan budget and the cuts to discretionary programs and the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid guarantees would disproportionately affect the women and children who are already suffering this year because of the sequestration.

The Ryan budget would dismantle the SNAP food program just like it does Medicare. About two-thirds of the SNAP benefits go to families with children. They rely on this.

The Ryan budget would roll back affordable health care provisions, bringing back gender-rating and allowing preexisting conditions like pregnancy and domestic violence.

Discretionary spending programs have already seen sequester cuts that will force women and families in need off of programs that help them. The Republican budget would further decimate these programs.

The special supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program, is one of our most successful and essential nutrition programs. Sequester will drop about 600,000 women and children from this program. Under the Republican budget, even more babies and mothers would be kicked off.

The new budget's enormous cuts would do even more than the sequester has done to destroy jobs and hurt our economic recovery. At a time when women are making unprecedented gains in higher education and the workforce, a war on jobs is a war on women and their families.

A budget is a moral document, and the Ryan budget fails this basic test of morality. This is wrong for women, and it is wrong for families, and we just reject this.

I thank you for the chance to talk about it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I appreciate your input and for being here tonight to participate in this Special Order. You've raised some very relevant points.

I want to talk about the special impact the Ryan budget has on the Pell Grant cuts.

One of the ways women try to climb out of poverty and close the pay gap is through education, especially higher education. And as we all know, college tuition has far outpaced inflation for

years and years. That's why programs such as the Pell Grant program are so important. And fully two-thirds of Pell Grant recipients are women.

Yet again, the Ryan Republican budget hurts women college students by cutting nearly \$83 billion—that's with a "b"—from Pell Grants over the next 10 years. They're doing this even though Congress already enacted and paid for annual mandatory inflationary increases in 2010 and recently cut Pell Grant benefits and eligibility to control costs. So the Ryan Republican budget will make it that much harder for women to climb the ladder of opportunity, get a college degree, get a decent job and start or maintain a family. It just does not need to be that way.

□ 1820

As President Obama has said, the math in this Ryan budget does not add up, and the math that is there cuts programs helping working women and single moms. The Ryan budget will be devastating for working women, low-income families and young women trying to afford college. Head Start, early childhood care, food stamps, Pell Grants for college, and so much more would be slashed under this budget. Let's start with early childhood education.

Many researchers and economists tell us that the very best investment that we can make in our society and in our children is in early childhood education. These cuts in the Ryan budget are on top of the \$85 billion from sequestration, which are already in effect. Because of the sequestration, 70,000 children nationwide will be kicked off of Head Start. Another 30,000 low-income children will lose child care assistance because of the cuts to the child care and development block grants. That's a total of 100,000 low-income kids being kicked out of early childhood services. That's already happening as we are speaking tonight on the floor. The Ryan budget would double those cuts, which would mean another 100,000 kids losing services.

What are the working moms of 200,000 children across the country supposed to do? Women only earn 74 cents to the dollar of what men earn in similar jobs. While they are at work, how are these women going to afford to take care of their kids when they lose these services?

The answer is they'll need to find another affordable child care option, which, if you're a mom, you know how difficult that is. Or you'll have to cut back on hours at work because there is no child care. This will only widen the already existing economic divide that separates men and women.

It's not just the economic divide between men and women. The gap between the haves and the have-nots, because of the Ryan budget and the Bush years, has never been greater, but that's not all. Many of these same families would also lose the assistance

they need so that they can feed their families.

Now from the great State of Maryland is the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS. It's good to hear that like-minded men have joined us in this Special Order on the Ryan budget and how it affects American families.

Thank you for being here.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It's my honor. I want to, first of all, thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank you for calling this Special Order.

As I was listening to you talk, particularly when you talked about Pell Grants and women, I could not help but think about something that you and I hear over and over and over again as we serve together on the Joint Economic Committee. We hear that the less education a person has the more recessionary periods affect them negatively. In other words, if you have a little education, less than a high school education, your chances of being put out of a job or of not having a job are great. If you have a college education, you have a better chance of retaining a job.

You talked a moment ago about women, and women with regard to Pell Grants. Just the other night, I was at Howard University's annual dinner where they were trying to raise money for students to get scholarships. The president of the university got up and said something that was very interesting. He said, We are now having to let young people go who have averages above 3.2 because they don't have the money. I can guarantee you most of those folks were women. He said, when they did the research and looked at young people who had left school years ago and when they just kind of tracked them, they noticed that only about 25 percent ever even returned to school.

What you're talking about is the quality of life for women. So, when you look at the Ryan budget cutting Pell Grants and cutting those things that women are so concerned about—their children and how they're going to be able to raise them, to nurture them, to give them a head start—those things are being cut as if somebody is just going through a forest, cutting down trees with a hatchet. I think that we have to stand up for women. We have to make sure that we let the Nation know what is being done in this budget and make it clear that we're not going to stand for it.

I just want to thank the gentlelady for her presentation tonight and for bringing us together with regard to this very, very important issue.

Keep in mind that he is talking about doing away with the Affordable Care Act. So much of the Affordable Care Act goes to keeping people well—keeping women well, keeping their children well, keeping their families well. It allows them to have affordable and accessible insurance, which is something that women are most concerned about,

and being able to pay comparable rates that men would be paying. I mean, he comes in, and he wants to just do away with the Affordable Care Act and create and give us this budget that really makes no sense.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman for his insight on how this budget is affecting his constituents, and to hear from him that women and men may have an almost perfect score in college and have to leave because they can't afford it, their Pell Grants have been cut—it's just unconscionable that the wealthiest country in the world is not there to invest in the next generation, in the next leaders, the next teachers and engineers that our country needs.

It's not just education. It's not just housing. We're talking about food on the table. Once again, as they did last year, House Republicans are proposing to slash the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This is commonly called the "food stamps." For people who don't have enough money for their food, this helps them, but they are calling for taking the food stamps and turning it into a block grant. Now, we who have worked in city, State, and Federal Governments know that "block grant" is another way of saying cut—permanently cut—and, in some cases, sliding it out of existence.

SNAP currently helps, roughly, 47 million low-income Americans afford the food they put on the tables every day, and during these past few years of the Great Recession, SNAP has been a lifeline to those in need, making sure that in the wealthiest country in the world American families don't have to go hungry. People who apply for food stamps need food. Now women make up, roughly, 60 percent of SNAP's adult beneficiaries, and more than half of SNAP households with children are headed by a single adult, the vast majority of whom—over 90 percent—are women. That means that single moms on SNAP are already struggling to make ends meet and to take care of their kids.

They will be losing these benefits because the Ryan Republican budget refuses to close the \$1.1 trillion in tax loopholes. Now, I for one say let's close those tax loopholes and keep the food on the tables of America's families who need it. I find that outrageous.

I am really thrilled that a new Member of Congress, LOIS FRANKEL—a woman with a great record of distinction in the State of Florida—has joined us. I want to thank her for coming and providing the perspective of her State. When it's cold, I know all my constituents want to be in Florida, but I'm pleased that she is here with us now.

Thank you for being here.

□ 1830

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY. I'm pleased to be with you. I came up here as a new Member in a bipartisan spirit, and I really wanted to be standing here

today embracing Mr. RYAN's plan; but I have to tell you, I'm worried about it. And I want to tell you why I'm worried about it. I'm worried about it for Sabrina, for Lucy, for Ruth, Lola, and Barbara.

I'm going to tell you about them. Sabrina is a small business owner. She has a little catering company. She called my office because she's looking for a way to get a small business loan so she can stay in business and improve it. It's hard today getting loans from the banks.

Lucy is a bright-eyed young student in a community college. She is thrilled to have a student loan, a Federal student loan.

Lola is a teacher who has a daughter with cerebral palsy, and she depends on services from the government to help her with her daughter.

And Ruth, Ruth is 91 years old. She used to be a ball of a fire, but she recently hurt herself. She just got out of the hospital, and she can't move around. She can hardly get out of bed. She depends on Meals on Wheels to feed her so she has food every day.

And then there is Barbara who's outlived most of her relatives. She's in a nursing home in my hometown, and she has Alzheimer's.

I know you ask me why I'm worried about them. You know why I'm worried about them, because they are the victims. They will be the victims of this proposed budget. And what's going to happen? Will Sabrina lose her business? Will Lucy have to drop out of school? Will Ruth go hungry? Will Lola have to give up her work so she can stay home with her daughter? Tell me something, who is going to take care of Barbara? Who's going to take care of her?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. No one. No one. She is going to have to quit her job and stay home and take care of Barbara.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Barbara is in no condition to take care of anybody. Listen, I think we all know, the American people know that we have to get our fiscal house in order. There is a deficit problem for us, but the American people want us to solve it in a responsible manner because I also know this: we still have a job problem out there. We have slow economic recovery. And now as we are just turning the corner, all of a sudden we have this plan, this bill, this proposal, this budget that independent analysts tell us is going to throw, what, 2 million people out of work, the majority of them women. It will really crush these people like Lucy, Ruth, and Lola and Barbara and Sabrina. We can tell each other hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of stories.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you for putting a human face on what it's meaning for people who are coming to your office for help. But also what has to be part of this equation is that the economy is still very fragile, and you can't cut your way to prosperity. These deep cuts

could put the economy in a tailspin. Chairman Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has testified that we need a balanced approach, that we shouldn't slash so severely. Many economists say that the American economy is doing better than Europe because we are not cutting as deeply as Europe is, so giving the economy a chance to recover.

So to go in with these draconian cuts, not only does it hurt people, such as with the stories you're telling us, but it could hurt the recovery, the overall economy that for the past 35 months has been growing private sector jobs and digging ourselves out of that deep recession, so it could possibly throw us back into it. You've raised an important point, and I yield back to you.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I ask another question: What is the logic in taking little children out of Head Start programs when we know that the path to middle class, the path to be able to take care of your family, to take care of yourself, to be a tax-paying citizen is education? So I ask you, Congresswoman, why would we pass a budget that would take 27,000—I think even more, I think the last sequester bill would take 27,000 children out of child care, Head Start, and this new budget doubles down. Why would we do that?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Well, I think you pointed out that this budget is not only draconian and unfair; it is filled with contradictions. Why in the world would you let these tax breaks continue for big oil companies that are making a profit, and we're subsidizing some of them to the tune of 40 percent, yet you're going to take the future of our young kids and throw them off. It is a total, total contradiction; and it's completely wrong.

I want to point out the biggest contradiction in this budget. It repeals the Affordable Care Act, but keeps the law's budget savings and uses it to balance their budget. So they say in the budget they're going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. How are they going to repeal it? It passed the Congress; it is the law of this country. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where this was a central point of debate; and, guess what, President Obama won the election, and he ran on the Affordable Care Act. So they say that they're going to repeal it. They don't have the votes to repeal it. And even if they did, he'd veto it. There's no way they can repeal it, so it is a complete—really a hoax. It's a hoax.

Then they claim to protect Medicare while ending Medicare as we know it for future seniors and our children and our grandchildren. And the biggest hoax, they sit there and say they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then they take the savings from the Affordable Care Act, the \$718 billion that was put there from the providers, and they use that to balance

their budget. So the numbers do not add up.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Let me ask you this: Does the repeal of the Affordable Care Act come with a repeal of people getting ill? I'm trying to figure out the logic here because if you repeal the Affordable Care Act, if you take Medicare and now you turn it into a voucher program or what they call "premium support," which means literally thousands of dollars more coming out of the seniors' pockets to take care of themselves, you're not repealing illness. All you're doing with this Ryan budget is shifting the burden back to the middle class.

You hit it on the head when you said let's keep giving those tax breaks to the big oil companies, the people who want to move their companies offshore, to big corporations with huge profits paying almost nothing in taxes. Here's how we're going to clean up our fiscal house: we're going to tell people when they're oldest and they're sickest, you're going to have to pay more money, or just don't get sick.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The gentledady is correct. They're shifting the burden onto the middle class, the elderly, and the poor. Again, President Obama's budget contains \$1.3 trillion in spending, and in that budget is \$1.1 trillion in tax breaks. So where are the priorities of this country? Close the tax breaks, keep the food on the table, or close the tax breaks and reduce the deficit.

I think they're not sincere about wanting to reduce the deficit and the debt because if they were, they would take those tax loopholes and close them. Some are important such as the deduction for a family's home. That allows many middle class and moderate middle class Americans to own their own home. They are able to deduct that.

□ 1840

But there are all these other deductions that make no sense. Why in the world are we giving a subsidy to companies that move jobs overseas? It's crazy. If anything, the subsidy should be for companies in America making it in America, creating jobs in America, and paying their taxes, their Social Security, and their Medicare in America.

So this whole budget is an exercise in contradictions and it's an exercise in, really, lack of good judgment or values, and I hope that we are able to defeat it.

I hope that the Democratic plan will be the one that is finally the one that passes. This is just the same old same old from the last 2 years: slash the safety net and protect tax breaks. The Ryan approach just isn't a balanced or, I would say, fair or valued approach.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Representative. I want to thank you for letting me join you here today.

I just want to say this. I know we've been standing up here and we've been critical of this Ryan budget and, re-

spectfully, I think we're just saying it like it is. But I want to just say this, and I know you feel the same way. I hope that we can vet it.

You know, we're venting our feelings here today. And our constituents need to know that we're going to stay strong for them and the women of this country, the Lucys, the Sabrinas, the Barbaras of this country, and of course the men that we love, too. But I hope that we can find a way, that we can find a middle ground, we can find a reasoned budget that gets people back to work, that we secure our families and we get our fiscal house in order in a reasonable amount of time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank you, Congresswoman, and you raised some important points.

And one that was not raised, that is the illnesses that we do not have cures for in this country. And one of the things that America's always led the world in is scientific research, yet this budget cuts that research. It cuts the National Institutes of Health that could come up with the cures for the diseases that she mentioned.

America is a place of innovation and medical advancements, and Congress should be focused on keeping that status, that we don't want to lose our leadership in innovation.

To give one example, breast cancer is one of the most common cancers among women. One in seven women will come down with breast cancer, and it is one of the leading causes of death among women of all races in America. In 2009, over 210,000 women in the United States were diagnosed with breast cancer, and over 40,000 women died from the disease.

Over the past 5 years, the National Institutes of Health spent more than \$3 billion on breast cancer research, which dwarfs any amount we see in the private sector or nonprofit sector. And yet, in the Ryan budget, the NIH would be cut and slashed by billions and billions of dollars, yet these dollars are the hope for saving lives. They're the hope for finding cures. And we know that health research has paid off.

Another important area is Alzheimer's. The number of women and men that contract Alzheimer's is huge and growing, and this cut will be cutting the research that we have in Alzheimer's and other lifesaving efforts to prevent Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other diseases.

So we've been making a lot of progress in health research and innovative research, and all of that research is really at risk under the Ryan Republican budget.

I am very pleased that one of my colleagues from the great State of Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who is a strong advocate for women, children, and families, has joined us. Thank you so much for being here tonight.

I yield the gentledady as much time as she may consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my friend from New York, Congress-

woman MALONEY, for her leadership on economic issues particularly impacting women, for the persistence of her introduction of the Equal Rights Amendment, long overdue, that we all join in to ensure the rights of women. And let me thank the gentlemen that are on the floor that joined us this evening.

I want to follow up, as I listened to the discussion that you just had, I met with Dr. Brinkley in the hallway, who is one of the leading researchers in biomolecular research from Baylor University, in my Congressional region, if you will. I consider representation because it is such a massive institution. And he brought with him two of his researchers. In fact, the headline on one of my papers was the standstill work of one of our important researchers because of the sequester, and certainly because of this budget. All of that points to women who are most vulnerable as relates to the needs of research in chronic illnesses.

Let me cite for my colleagues about this question of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security what is drastically cut and reordered under the Ryan Republican budget. I'm really saddened that misinformation comes that the Medicare's predominance, in terms of its help, goes to those who are fat cats.

Let me share some numbers with you. Many of these are women. We do know that women live longer, and so the needs that they have for Medicare and Social Security may be extended.

And may I take something out of our vocabulary, though it is in the dictionary. Medicare and Social Security are earned. I don't know where we got the word "entitlement," because entitlement suggests you're entitled with no basis of responsibility. But they earned this. Women earned this.

And women started before the fight that we had, Congresswoman, for pay equity over the last decade or two. They were making the lower wages, and so their Social Security input had to be much lower as they continued to work years in.

But let me just share with you on the Medicare beneficiaries:

Annual income less than \$22,500: 50 percent of the Medicare beneficiaries include in that number women;

Chronic conditions: of those who receive Medicare, 40 percent include in that number women;

Fair and poor health: 27 percent, women in that population;

Cognitive mental impairment: 23 percent, women in that population;

Functional limitations: 15 percent, women in that calculation.

So, as I look at this budget, 60 percent of it is taking away health care from the poor and middle class, which would include women.

The idea that the bill slants itself toward protecting the interests of the wealthy by not listing any deduction that you're willing to take. Now, I know if we get into a discussion about deductions, we put ourselves in that circle; but let me just say, middle class

Americans need mortgage deductions. I know, however, that that is one that is under discussion.

But why did our friends writing this budget not list the deductions that they would be willing to put on the table? Some of us realize that mortgage deductions help young families. It helps single women. It helps women who are maintaining or getting their first house. So here we have a special emphasis.

I'm glad my colleague mentioned breast cancer. I have introduced legislation on triple negative. It happens to have a far-reaching impact on women from all ethnic groups, whether they are Caucasian, whether they are Hispanic, or whether they are African American or Asian, but it is a deadly form of the disease, a more deadly form of the disease. And so that kind of research which many of us are arguing for is now limited because of this budget.

The budget does not—well, let me just say this. The budget takes for its own what was accomplished with the savings in the Affordable Care Act. It takes for its own the cuts that we made, were willing to make in 2012, over a trillion in cuts and spending. And it totally ignores economists who have indicated that the austerity format that was taken in Europe was the completely wrong direction, and that, then, impacts our families more negatively.

□ 1850

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to point out and make sure that our colleagues and the listening public know that the Ryan plan assumes the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. So these cuts are on top of that. And according to the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office, the sequester could cause the U.S. economy to lose 750,000 jobs. And the Ryan plan compounds these job losses.

The Economic Policy Institute has initial estimates that the House Republican budget would cost 2 million jobs in 2014 alone, relative to current policy. So why in the world would we want to take these steps that are going to result in job loss?

I yield back to the lady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for that astute assessment. When I give these various points, women are disproportionately placed. Many of them are heads of households, many of them are senior women. Many are going back into the workforce because they have resource shortages, if you will. And the Ryan budget takes in all of these; i.e., the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. By the way, again, I introduced legislation to eliminate the sequester provision out of the Budget Reconciliation Act. I happen to think that it is meritorious because we need

to start from a fair point of view, not what I call nickel and diming, ending people's research, closing doors in the Capitol, and a number of other things that are not good for America.

But let me just finish on this. If we're interested in R&D, as we indicated, or clean energy—slashed. Obviously, it will have an impact on the quality of life of families who are raising their children. What about nutrition assistance, the SNAP program? What an obliterating cut to the SNAP program, which is now serving 48 million people. Let me remind my colleagues that these are military persons, women who are in the military. These are young families. These are individuals who are in school. And so women are disproportionately impacted.

And this, I think, is clearly one of the largest conflicts of reason, and that is to underfund or take away the funding for the Affordable Care Act, which has been reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court and has been documented as having a health care savings and providing for a healthier America. And here we are taking away coverage from 27 million Americans.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. They take away the good aspects of it, all the preventive and the health care. They propose to eliminate that, but then they keep the tax savings from it to balance their budget. It is a hoax. It's not realistic. It's not true. And I really appreciate your words here today on the floor.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They take all the good things that, might I say, the Democrats have worked on and can really be defined as balanced and fair and utilize it in a budget that is absolutely lopsided. And I thank you for having us on the floor to explain to the women of America why this budget will not be good for them, their children, or their expanded families, and that we're committed to standing against this kind of approach that is really not the American way.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady.

In conclusion, Americans can't afford more fuzzy math and budget gimmicks. We need real solutions that help grow our economy, create jobs, support the health and economic security of our seniors, and one that will address the arbitrary sequester cuts. Chairman RYAN's budget fails to address any of these.

Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few. That's their plan. The reality is that the majority's Ryan budget harms those who need help and doles out tax breaks and benefits to those who do not. So let me be as clear as I possibly can: the Ryan budget, if it were passed by the House, would risk our recovery.

I want to thank all the participants tonight. I thank the like-minded men

who came to the floor to support us and the women that have spoken out tonight on how the budget affects women, children, and their expanded families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 803, SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFE-LONG SKILLS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-16) on the resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FIREARMS TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us and pass the bipartisan legislation to strengthen Federal penalties for straw purchasing of firearms. I'm a hunter and a gun owner, and I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. I support law-abiding Americans' right to own firearms, and nothing in this legislation infringes upon that right. This bill simply helps keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals who cannot legally buy guns on their own.

I chair the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force. Our task force has developed a comprehensive set of policy principles that will help reduce gun violence. To develop these principles, we met with virtually everyone who had an interest on this issue: Republicans, Democrats, the NRA, gun owners and gun safety groups, mental health experts, educational leaders, people from the video game and movie industries, hunting and sportsman's groups, law enforcement leaders, and the Vice President of the United States. Out of these meetings, one of the principles we developed dealt specifically with strengthening penalties