

Washington to agree on every issue. But they do expect us to put the Nation's interest before party interests. They do expect us to forge reasonable compromise where we can. Our work will not be easy. But America only moves forward when we do so together—when we accept certain obligations to one another and to future generations. That's the American story. And that's how we will write the next great chapter—together.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2013.

□ 1230

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(b) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Pub. L. 112-272), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the World War I Centennial Commission:

Mr. TED POE, Humble, Texas

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), as amended by section 1601 of Pub. L. 111-68, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center:

Mr. FORTENBERRY, Nebraska

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions on Monday, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today. In addition, we'll take up an expected Senate amendment to the House's continuing

resolution, ensuring that the Federal Government remains funded beyond March 27. We'll also consider a resolution providing for the funding of the House's committees. This is a responsible resolution that makes tough choices and abides by sequestration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Republican House will consider and pass a budget resolution on time for a third consecutive year. The Republican plan, put forward by Chairman PAUL RYAN in the Budget Committee, will increase economic growth and job creation, cut wasteful government spending, and strengthen our entitlement programs. And for the first time in recent memory, the House budget will balance in 10 years.

Before I yield back, I would like to acknowledge the launch of the House Historian's new Web site, "The House and Selma: Bridging History and Memory." This important historical record is now available for the public to explore at History.House.gov. It will soon include oral testimonies from Members of Congress, like JOHN LEWIS, describing their role and contributions to the civil rights movement.

I was proud to have joined Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Congresswomen TERRI SEWELL and MARTHA ROBY, the gentleman from Maryland, as well as others, in that trip to Selma and Montgomery this year. But to those in particular who were actively involved in the unveiling of this project, I look forward to its growth in the years to come.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would remark that I was pleased that he had the opportunity to go to Selma with JOHN LEWIS and others of us who had the opportunity to go to the birthplace of our colleague, TERRI SEWELL. Congresswoman SEWELL is on the floor.

The March to Selma, of course, which was interdicted by members of the Alabama State Police at the direction of the Governor, was one of the advances, the gentleman knows, that led to the introduction, passage, and signing by President Johnson of the Voting Rights Act. We are privileged to serve with someone whose contribution to this country and to the realization of its promise of equality to all was so enhanced by the life and commitment and courage of JOHN LEWIS, our colleague. And I was glad that the gentleman participated with us on that. I also am very pleased to hear about the Web site. I think that's a very positive step. I want to thank the gentleman also for the information about next week.

Mr. Leader, I would first like to ask about the budget resolution that you referenced that will be coming next week. I wondered if there's any plan on the floor to replace the sequester, which all of us seem to think is irrational—at least I think it's irrational and most of the colleagues I talk to think that it is irrational in that it is a meat-ax approach, and we have of-

fered a number of times to get to the same budget savings—but notwithstanding that, whether there was any thought of replacing the sequester with its cuts to high priority and low priority by the same percentage to replace that. Is there any plan to do that, as far as you know?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the CR, and the amendments that the Senate is working on, contains within it measures dealing with certain sectors of government that prescribe for spending plans that avoid that very blunt, indiscriminate approach that the gentleman speaks about in the across-the-board sequestration formula. The gentleman knows I agree with him. These kinds of cuts are not smart. They are indiscriminate. They cut good programs just like they cut bad programs.

I don't think any of us would choose to do things that way. I look forward to working with him to see what we can do to even expand the prescription to go beyond that which is in the sequester.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and that would be a positive effort, I think, towards that. Of course, if we could adopt a budget and if we could adopt appropriation bills and Ways and Means recommendations pursuant to such a budget, that would be a very much appreciated option to the sequester. Having said that, the Budget Committee did a markup this week on Wednesday, and I know members of the committee worked well into the night, both Republicans and Democrats. And I wanted to ask the gentleman, I know that normally when we bring a budget—both sides have brought a budget—which does in fact allow for substitutes, but for the most part it does not allow individual amendments.

Now I say that because so many amendments were rejected in the committee. Mr. CÁRDENAS from California offered an amendment to protect the mortgage interest deduction for the middle class. That amendment was voted for unanimously by Democrats and unanimously opposed by Republican members of the committee. Mr. CICILLINE offered an amendment to protect workers from privatizing Social Security. Again, on a partisan vote, with Democrats supporting the Cicilline amendment and Republicans opposing it, it was rejected.

Mr. JEFFRIES from New York offered an amendment to prevent the student loan interest rate from doubling, which as the gentleman knows is set to occur on June 30 without our action. Again, unfortunately, on the same partisan vote—the Democrats voting for the Jeffries amendment and Republicans voting against it—it failed. Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin offered an amendment to protect middle class Americans from tax increases. It seems to me that we have agreement on that; but, nevertheless, that amendment was rejected,

again, on a partisan vote, with Democrats voting for it and Republicans voting against it.

□ 1240

Mr. Leader—which I don't understand—KURT SCHRADER from Oregon offered a sense of Congress amendment on the need for long-term, balanced deficit reduction. That was also rejected on a party-line basis. And I could go on and mention other amendments—there were approximately 28 of them.

My question to you is, Mr. Leader, is it possible that any of those amendments would be made in order so that the House might work its will on those propositions? And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

What I would say in response, as the gentleman knows, it has been the tradition of the House, both with Republican and Democratic majorities, that when the budget comes to the floor, there are substitutes that are offered. As the gentleman knows, the budget is a very complex and large document, and there are easy ways to perhaps distort one's intent by offering amendments. I believe—and I would just venture to guess—that's why the tradition is as it is, both under Democratic majority and Republican, which is to allow for substitutes, and anticipate a very robust debate around the offering of substitutes, as well as the passage of our budget next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would suggest that the amendments put forward do in fact express policy, which of course is what the budget does. Those policies are pretty straightforward in terms of not raising taxes on the middle class, on making sure that students don't have to pay higher interest for their loans, and making sure that we do in fact proceed with a comprehensive agreement not only to replace the sequester, but to, in a bipartisan way, get us on a road to fiscal sustainability.

Regrettably—as I think the gentleman probably knows—most budgets are usually partisan documents, whether they're offered by Democrats or Republicans. I understand that. Rarely have we been in the position that we now find ourselves in, however. Rarely have I experienced, in the 32 years I've been here—if ever—the fiscal crises that occur on such a regular basis here. The public, I think the economy, and I think the business community, and indeed the international community, is hoping that we get on a solid path.

The gentleman mentioned that the budget was a complex document. I think that's a fair statement. But, unfortunately, the budget that has been proposed—which the gentleman is very pleased to say balances within 10 years—unfortunately doesn't tell us how it's going to do so. It is in fact filled with conclusions, but not with policies to get us to that end.

In fact, Dana Milbank of The Washington Post—I think you probably read this—said there are so many blanks in the Ryan budget that it could be a Mad Libs exercise, which I understand is a children's book that sort of has a couple of sentences and the rest is fill in the blanks.

This, of course, is not a game; it's black budgeting, in my opinion, an expression of lofty aims—that is, that we balance within 12 years, which I think, frankly is—if there were no Democrats in the Congress of the United States, I tell my friend with all due respect, if there were no Democrats in the Congress of the United States, in my view you could not implement the Ryan budget. You couldn't get appropriation bills passed, and you could not pass a Ways and Means tax provision that would meet the requirements of the Ryan budget.

In addition to that, Mr. Leader, you and I both know we voted over 30 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It's not going to happen. If we want to do something in a bipartisan fashion, if we want to get to an end here, we ought to stop pretending that we're going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We had an election about that. We won. The President won. Very frankly, even in the House there were more people who voted for Democrats than voted for Republicans for the House of Representatives.

Having said that, you're in charge. That's the law, and you won fair and square. But having said that, we're going to need to get to an agreement. I would hope that as we deal with the budget—and I will oppose the Ryan budget. I think the Ryan budget is unrealistic. I think the Ryan budget will not possibly be able to balance within 10 years. I wish we could. But if we do that, we're going to badly damage the economy that the gentleman talks about. We're going to undermine the creation of jobs. I don't say that; CBO says that. CBO says the sequester itself is going to cost us 750,000 to 1 million jobs. The Ryan budget, if adopted, would cost us over 2 million jobs.

So I'm hopeful that as we consider the budget—and my expectation is your budget will probably pass this House, but my hope is, and urging, Mr. Leader, is that we deal with this budget—and I don't know whether the Murray budget is going to pass or not through the Senate. I hope they pass some alternative, not because the budget-for-pay bill passed—which I think was a terrible bill to put on this floor and a terrible bill to pass. I think it sets a terrible precedent about you've got to pass something or you don't get paid. That's not what our democracy is about. People voting their conscience is what our democracy ought to be about, not about whether they get paid.

But in any event, Mr. Leader, I'm hopeful that in fact we can get to, in some form or fashion of another, a budget and appropriation bills and a

Ways and Means bill that can be signed by the President, passed by the Senate, passed by this House so we can put our country on a fiscally sustainable path.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I appreciate the gentleman and his sentiments in wanting to try and work together.

As he knows, I have always held the position that there are going to be differences in this House. I hear the gentleman saying he doesn't want to support the Ryan budget; that's why we're going to have debate on his party's alternative budget. But I agree with the gentleman, we ought to try and reach some type of resolution. The best way forward to do that, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, is to be able to set the differences aside.

We have big differences on health care. We believe that ObamaCare is not good for this country, not good for health care, and we're going to continue to advocate that position. Because, unfortunately, what we're going to see is a continuing increase in cost, rate shock that will come into play over the next year, where more and more of the American people are going to realize this is going to be a very expensive endeavor, with a big question mark as to whether the quality of health care is going to stay the same, improve, or whether it will stagnate and become worse. That question is still unanswered.

We believe very strongly in our position that it ought to be patient-centered care. We ought not have this board of 15 unelected bureaucrats empowered to cut or deny care for seniors. As the gentleman knows, we disagree strongly on health care.

We disagree strongly on taxes. We don't want to raise taxes. We just had a huge tax increase in the beginning of the year. We don't think you ought to be raising taxes in this town every quarter. But every time we hear from the President—because we heard, and he was nice enough to come and visit our conference this week, we heard yet again the cry for more taxes.

We saw an introduction of the Murray budget in the Senate—\$1 trillion of more taxes. To try and say that the American people are going to be benefited by that kind of tax levy I think is something we take strong exception with.

But the gentleman's right: we can agree on some things. Let's go find where we can agree. And I look forward to doing the things that we can do together, like extending the welfare reforms that we did this week, like making sure that we also do the things we did today on the floor—without much help from the other side—and that is, Mr. Speaker, try and put some good government practices into place.

That SKILLS Act came from a recommendation of the GAO. It said you've got 50 programs, a maze of bureaucracy. Unemployed people have a very difficult time of even beginning to navigate that maze if they want skills to get back to work.

□ 1250

That was the essence behind the bill.

We also said you need some flexibility. Take people and put them back to work. So get the community colleges and the other training forces in place to respond to the marketplace where there are job openings, not some micromanaged idea of what that should be from Washington. I think we can agree on some kind of commonsense principles like that.

So, again, I appreciate the sentiment of the gentleman and look forward to working with him on some of the very big challenges we face, as well as those issues that working families face every single day.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader says that his side is against the Affordable Care Act. He's said that regularly since it was first considered. He's said they're against revenues. Mr. Speaker, he's said that repeatedly, and the majority party has said that repeatedly. Of course, pursuant to the Republican tax bill of '01 and '03, rates went up on January 1. They went up substantially.

You could look at it half full or half empty, and the gentleman looks at it, as we increase \$600 billion in taxes—actually, taxes would have proposed \$4 trillion had the tax law that was in effect at that time stayed in effect. The gentleman knows that, so you can look at it as a tax increase or a tax decrease, ensuring that middle class taxpayers didn't get an increase.

The American people, of course, 80 percent of them say what we did is the right thing. Now, we had an election, and the gentleman's position did not prevail in that election. But we are still hoist on the petard of saying, We disagree; do it our way or the highway.

The gentleman mentions the SKILLS Act. I wish we'd had an opportunity. We need to make the programs more focused and more effective, and the gentleman is absolutely right on that. Unfortunately, the majority gave no ability to have bipartisan input into that bill, and so its prospects for passage are almost minimal, maybe nil, so that the gentleman's party continues to, in my view, keep us in this gridlock. We understand your position. You understand our position. We've both got to come off our positions.

The American public elected a House of Representatives that's led by Republicans and a Senate run by Democrats. The only way democracy is going to work is if we come to an agreement. And simply restating what I know to be your position or my restating what I know my position is, we've already come, I think, a pretty far way towards your position in trying to reduce spending, about \$1 trillion worth, which, by the way, your budget takes credit for.

We have a baseline that's been reduced because of the revenues that are in the Affordable Care Act, which you take credit for. You take credit for the

\$715 billion in your budget while repealing the Affordable Care Act, but you take credit for the \$750 billion that reduced the baseline. So that on the one hand, you want to say, I'm against this; on the other hand, you want to use the revenue that it produced or the baseline that it reduced.

We have this same debate every week. It doesn't get us anywhere. The American public is pretty upset with all of us. They ought to be. I tell the press that 10 percent of the people think we're doing okay. They're wrong. We're not doing okay, and our country, as a result, is not having the kind of success in growing jobs that it ought to have.

Now, let me ask you, because I don't think you're going to change my mind or I'm going to change yours right now—

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I'd be glad to yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Just to respond to the gentleman's allegations that somehow there wasn't an open process in the passage of the SKILLS Act, if I recall, this week there were reports that the gentleman's members, the members of the minority, walked out on the committee markup. Now, if you can't show up for work, how are you going to participate in the markup and shaping of a bill? The committee process was fair; it was open. There were hearings. There was a markup, and the gentleman's members on the minority side chose not to participate.

Now, if you're asking what the American people expect, I think they expect that there's going to be disagreement, but I think they expect everybody to show up for work, and that didn't happen.

So I say to the gentleman, we continue—and he has my commitment, and he knows that—to work together and to have an open process. Our Speaker has continued to uphold that as a goal. So I hope we can sort of resolve that lingering question, especially around this bill. The SKILLS Act is something we should have all agreed on.

Mr. HOYER. I wish I had the figures in front of me, and I don't. It's my understanding the SKILLS Act was introduced February 25 and marked up shortly thereafter. There may have been hearings in the last year when the SKILLS Act was passed in a partisan vote, but the reason the members walked out was because they didn't believe they were given an opportunity to interface. I don't have the facts as strongly as I ought to have them, but I believe that the proximity of introduction and markup was very, very close, and therefore the opportunity and the inclination of the committee to engage in a bipartisan discussion of what the bill ought to look like—what should have been a bipartisan bill—was not there. But let me get my facts straighter so we can discuss that perhaps a little further at some point.

April's schedule, Mr. Leader, Mr. Speaker, if the majority leader could give us some information on the April schedule as we go forward.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond to the gentleman's request. Just to give a general idea of the kinds of things that we'll be considering upcoming, we'll look to do and consider some cybersecurity legislation that will result from the work of multiple committees. The gentleman knows, as well as I, that we face a very serious threat in the cybersecurity arena, and we want to take action as a House. We want to take bipartisan action, and I look forward to working with him on that.

We're also going to be taking up the Working Families Flexibility Act. This will be a bill designed to provide working moms and dads with some flexibility as they try and manage their obligations at work and at home.

We also are going to be looking at taking up some measures in the area of health care and innovation and in pursuit of an agenda that focuses on medical research. I know the gentleman has been a big champion of that, and we, as well, believe it's very important for us to maintain the American leadership in innovation which is premised upon the devotion of resources to medical research, to curing disease, and to developing therapies that increase and enhance the quality of life for so many Americans who are afflicted by disease. We'll be working on that.

We'll also be looking at some legislation in the area of domestic energy production that will lead to more jobs, that will lead to more energy independence for America.

These are the kinds of things that we look to in April, Mr. Speaker, and I would tell the gentleman, again, I look forward to working with him in an open process, in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

We're ending now, but I know you have an extraordinarily able assistant sitting to your right who advises you on issues of great importance to our country. The gentleman to my right does the same thing for me.

The gentleman to my right went to Wake Forest. Maryland played Wake Forest last night, and I hope as we play Duke tonight that we are equally successful. Mr. Nevins, who is a graduate of Duke, it's going to be a little tougher game than Wake Forest. I understand that. But we look forward to trying to be successful in that effort.

Kyle Nevins is a wonderful member of the majority leader's staff. He worked for my dear and close friend, ROY BLUNT, for some period of time, and he began working for Mr. CANTOR in 2008 as his floor director. He's been a real delight to work with, and I know Mr. Burnes and my floor staff all appreciate all the work he has done.

While I want to be very effusive today, I want him to know that I will be rooting very vigorously against Duke tonight when they play Maryland.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 18, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING

(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. Mr. Speaker, a durable medical equipment supplier recently sued the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services over Medicare's competitive bidding program. In February, the judge dismissed the case, stating the supplier had no jurisdiction because Congress prohibited judicial review of the program in 2003.

The court was, however, "deeply concerned about the unjust consequences of its order"; so concerned, the court was compelled to issue a memorandum prior to its full opinion:

Every citizen is entitled to equal justice under law, which is not measured by incidence of death or hospital admissions, but rather by the right to receive medically necessary treatment and to live each day with dignity. To the extent that a civilized society is measured by the manner in which it protects its most vulnerable members, it has failed today.

Congress has a responsibility to beneficiaries to ensure CMS is transparent and the competitive bidding program is truly competitive and does not prevent access to these critical services.

I will not be complacent, Mr. Speaker, and this body should not be content with a culture of insecurity for providers and the vulnerable populations that they serve.

The American people deserve better.

□ 1300

TRIBUTE TO DR. DINA STALLINGS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to Dr. Dina Stallings, a professor of forensics at Riverside Community College, beloved by her students and whose passing my community mourns deeply. This Sunday, my community will join together to celebrate her life, which was devoted to teaching the art of persuasive speaking.

Dr. Stallings achieved national recognition during her 26-year career at

RCC directing the Forensics and Debate Program. She was the first woman to be named a full professor at RCC. In the 1960s and 1970s, she coached teams that won national competitions.

After retiring, Dr. Stallings continued a deep involvement with Friends of Forensics, a group she founded to promote speaking activities for students from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Mr. Speaker, we count ourselves fortunate to have had Dr. Stallings as a leader in our community. Her commitment to faith, family, and forensics has left a profound impact on the Inland Empire and our Nation. As Dr. Stallings said herself, you measure yourself by the service you give to others.

Let us measure up to her legacy in both our service to America and our democratic discourse.

LET'S PASS A RESPONSIBLE
BUDGET

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, it's the job of this Congress to pass a responsible budget that protects our seniors and offers a future for our generations to come, the same future that you and I enjoy today.

Like Goldilocks, the American people have three choices:

We have the Senate Democratic plan, which raises taxes, increases spending, and never balances. That's too much government.

Then we have the President's plan, which—wait. No. We don't have the President's plan yet, although it was due last month. He keeps talking about a balanced approach, but he leaves out one key component in his budget. It doesn't actually balance. That's not governing at all.

Finally, we have the House Republican plan, which takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction and job growth. A balanced budget isn't some fairytale. It's not just another Washington talking point. It offers real results for the American people. It will grow our economy, it will create 5 million new jobs, and it would increase the median income for Americans to over \$80,000.

Republicans are offering a middle way to move forward, and I think the American people will find that this proposal is just right.

CLEAN ENERGY AND EXTREME
WEATHER

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we've come a long way with clean energy over the last 4 years. We've doubled the production of clean renewable energy like wind and solar. And the new tailpipe standards for automobiles will

double the fuel efficiency of our passenger vehicles.

Still, there's much that needs to be done. Study after study has shown that the effects of climate change are occurring sooner and with greater effect than expected. Superstorm Sandy, the devastating drought that hurt farmers in the Midwest, last summer's heat waves, and forest fires—scientists tell us that these are signs of climate change, and it is going to get worse if we don't act to address it.

Over the last 2 years, the United States has experienced 25 weather disasters that have caused more than \$180 billion in damage.

It's time to get serious about clean energy. The consequences are too grave to do otherwise.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, this week Senate Democrats introduced a budget that will never balance—ever. But it does raise taxes by \$1 trillion, so that will be helpful to working families.

The good news is next week we will have an opportunity to consider the House budget proposal which properly addresses the spending problem and makes commonsense reforms in order to pay down our debt.

Keeping with the committee's theme of balancing the budget within 10 years, I've introduced my own balanced budget amendment, House Joint Resolution 36, which also balances within 10 years.

We don't want to balance the budget on the backs of taxpayers. That's why we require a three-fifths majority to raise revenue and the debt limit. It also requires agencies and departments to justify their funding.

We are living in modern times, so it is allowed to be waived during times of war, during military conflict, or during natural disasters. Forty-nine States, including Pennsylvania where I live, do this. Single moms, families, cops on the beat, working folks do it, and Washington should do it too.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, another House Republican budget filled with the same gimmicks and fuzzy math that the American people soundly rejected last fall during the Presidential election. It's another budget that slashes critical economic investments, undermines job growth, and attempts to reduce the deficit on the backs of our seniors, disabled, women, and low-income families.