

basketball tournament is about to begin. But it is March madness in Washington as well, as the debate starts today over what kind of country we are going to leave to our children and grandchildren.

Later this afternoon, the House begins this conversation in earnest with a debate over the Federal budget. For the third year in a row, House Republicans will offer a budget that will balance, and this time we are putting forward a plan that will do so in 10 years. We do this by making careful cuts in spending and without raising your taxes.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't submitted his budget yet; although he was required by law to do so on February 4. And the proposed Senate budget raises taxes by \$1.5 trillion without ever balancing.

Mr. Speaker, the pathway to getting our country back on track begins today. Let's remember America's children and grandchildren as we engage in this important debate.

#### FORT HOOD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, 3½ years ago, our Nation was viciously attacked when an Islamic extremist opened fire on our troops at Fort Hood. We lost 14 innocent Americans that day, 12 military servicemembers, one civilian, and an unborn child.

Since the attack, the Fort Hood community has seen and felt an outpouring of support from across the State of Texas and the Nation, but not from the Federal Government. Currently, the troops killed and wounded in this horrible attack are denied the treatment, benefits, and honors granted to soldiers who are attacked overseas in a declared combat zone. The Pentagon deems this attack "workplace violence" rather than "combat violence."

This is shameful, and Americans should be outraged by the administration's refusal to acknowledge this wrong. Our troops were attacked on U.S. soil in a blatant terrorist attack, and we owe it to these patriots and all who wear the uniform to provide for them. They willingly and admirably put their lives on the line every day to protect our freedom.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 705, the Fort Hood Victims and Families Benefits Protection Act, and start providing the needed assistance for the victims and families of this terrible tragedy. Our troops deserve better.

May God bless all who serve.

□ 1240

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 122

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 22, 2013, through April 8, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; (b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and (c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 good friend, the ranking member from New York, pending which time I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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, that was a mouthful as the Clerk was reading through this resolution, and it was an exciting mouthful. I'm not sure that folks actually were able to get from just the prose the excitement that is in this rule today.

What this rule provides for is two very important things. I'm going to take them in order of my personal passion, but they're both equally important. Number one, this rule provides that every single Member of this House—not just Republicans, not just Democrats, not just folks who are favored, not any particular category—but every single Member of this House who represents a constituency back home had an opportunity to submit their own budget for the United States of America.

So often, the problem in this town is not enough good ideas, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have that problem today because every Member of the House that chose to submit a budget is going to have their budget considered and debated on the floor of this House if we pass this rule today.

Now, that is only five budgets, Mr. Speaker, five plus the Budget Committee's mark, because it's not easy to put together a budget. A lot of folks talk a good game about what they would do if they were king for a day; but when you try to craft your own budget, you've got to put, literally, money where your mouth and ideas are.

In this rule, we make in order a Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget, a Progressive Caucus substitute budget, and a substitute budget by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). We make in order a budget introduced by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina that tries to capture the essence of what the Senate is working on right now, and we make in order a budget produced by the Republican Study Committee. All of those exist as an alternative to the budget that was produced by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of sitting on the Budget Committee. What you see here in my hand is the Budget Committee report. We produced this on March 15. It's bound and it's published. They did a very nice job. It's been proofread, and the minority has had a chance to add their views. That was March 15 that we produced this budget.

But as we sit here today with March quickly leaving us, what we do not have yet is a budget from the United States President. I only point that out, Mr. Speaker, to say I understand that it's hard to produce a budget. I know because I produced one in this cycle. I had the great pleasure of working with a team that produced the Republican Study Committee budget and produced the House budget. So in a time period where the President has failed to follow the legally required mandate of introducing a budget by the first week of February, I've had the great pleasure of producing two budgets.

My friends on the Progressive Caucus have produced a budget. My friends on the Congressional Black Caucus have produced a budget. My friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has produced a budget. And I think it is fair when we ask in this debate why we have been denied a chance to look at the President's budget. We didn't see it in February. We didn't see it in March. Word has it now we might see it in April.

It's hard work to produce a budget, but it's important work. In fact, it's legally required work. I take great pride not just that the House will meet its statutory deadline, but that we're meeting it in this very open and honest forum as this rule proposes.

But the second thing this rule does, Mr. Speaker, is it provides for consideration of the committee funding resolu-

tion. This Congress doesn't have a penny to spend except for pennies that we take from the American taxpayer. That's the only place any revenue comes into this United States Government. Part of that revenue goes to fund this very institution.

Thrift begins at home, Mr. Speaker. Before you and I arrived in this body, Mr. Speaker, the committee process here in this House was authorized to spend \$300 million a year. Now, the committees do amazing work. It's important work to produce reports like this Budget Committee report, and they do the oversight on the executive branch. I don't for a minute suggest that the work that the committee structure does isn't critical to the functioning of our Republic. But every single account in the United States Government has to be looked at, examined, critiqued, and reformed if we are to get our fiscal books back in order.

The very first committee funding resolution you and I had a chance to vote on, Mr. Speaker, we reduced that committee funding from \$300 million back in the 111th Congress down to around \$260 in the 112th.

□ 1250

Here we come down again to \$240 million in this resolution. In the 26 now short months that you and I have served in Congress, Mr. Speaker, this body has examined its own books and reduced its spending by 20 percent on committees. That is not an easy task. That's not a task that came lightly. That's a task that has taken tremendous effort by both the majority and the minority.

But my question is, Mr. Speaker, if we can do it, as the American people expect us to do, what could the executive branch do? If we in the people's House can take 20 percent out because our constituents have demanded that we view every single dollar with an eye toward thrift, what could the executive branch do if only they would partner with us as we begin the leadership right here in this body?

None of the easy decisions are left, Mr. Speaker. The only decisions left to be decided in this budget, to be decided in this rule, are the hard decisions. We have provided in this rule the opportunity to consider every alternative that Members have proposed to decide these solutions, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Through numerous budget resolutions and campaign pledges and appearances on Sunday talk shows, the majority has made clear that their vision for America is a vision that says the Nation can no longer care for our seniors, that we must halt vital scientific research and that we should let our bridges and schools crumble because we can't afford to invest in the future.

In short, I believe that it is an extreme and cynical version for America and one that I strongly reject.

For more than a decade, the needs of our country were neglected while the majority led two unfunded wars and gave unaffordable tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, and we now have the cost for the last war in Iraq of \$3 trillion borrowed. In all the discussions on the deficit and what had shape we are in, nobody ever talks about that war and how that has kept us from rebuilding the infrastructure in the United States that cries out for it.

These two decisions unraveled the balanced budget achieved by President Clinton and exploded our Nation's debt. Now after a decade of reckless financial management, the majority is proposing another budget that is as unserious as it is extreme.

Take, for example, the field of scientific research. More than 50 percent of our economic growth since World War II can be attributed to the development and adoption of new technologies, yet the budget proposes drastic cuts to research at the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, among others.

As any scientist will tell you—and I am one—you cannot turn research on and off like a faucet. Across the Federal Government, researchers are on the brink of discoveries that could cure diseases or open entire new fields of commerce. But under the majority's budget, that valuable research will be ended and these important discoveries will probably not be made in the United States.

The majority wants to impose such cuts on top of cuts contained in the sequester, even though the effects of the sequester are just beginning to be felt. For example, in the coming weeks, airport control towers will begin to close, affecting flight schedules and stranding travelers. Many of these towers are located in the rural parts of our country where there are no other alternatives for long-distance travel.

In addition, border patrol agents will be furloughed, which not only affects security but the success of our economy. According to the Congressional Research Service, more than \$1.3 billion a day in trade crosses the U.S.-Canada border. This trade is dependent upon the effective operation of our border security agents. The effects of the sequester are already impacting trade by causing backups at the border and leaving goods and supplies stranded en route to their destination.

Furthermore, it is often forgotten that 5 years after I-35 collapsed above the Mississippi River, we have still failed to repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Earlier today, the American Society of Civil Engineers released a 2013 report card for America's infrastructure. They found that one in eight bridges in my home State of New York is structurally deficient and one in nine

bridges across the United States is the same. A very prominent engineer stated just this past week that there are bridges in major cities in areas of the United States which he would not cross for fear of falling into the water. At the same time, more and more engineers and transportation experts are warning that our bridges will soon be too unsafe to cross unless we act.

These bridges aren't alone. Everything from schools to airports to train stations and highways are literally crumbling before our eyes.

Water systems in many of the major cities in parts of the United States are almost a century old and almost unusable.

Think, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, think of the jobs that would be created, as badly as we need them to put people back to work, if we could not decide to starve again our country's needs and instead start to rebuild the needs and put people back to work.

I think it's inexcusable that instead of responding to the crisis that we have, the majority spent the last 2 years lurching from crisis to crisis and repeatedly introducing legislation such as today's budget legislation that guts investment in the Nation's infrastructure instead of putting us back to work rebuilding the country.

A telling illustration of the failed approach is that they have included the repeal of the Affordable Care Act as the central tenet of their budget proposal. During the 112th Congress, the majority held more than 30 votes in the last 2 years just to repeal the Affordable Care Act, eating up valuable time and costing taxpayers millions of dollars in the process. Despite this expensive folly, the majority wants to do it again. In order to balance the budget, the majority believes we should repeal the lifesaving law and once again legalize health insurance discrimination based upon preexisting conditions, force young adults off their parents' health insurance and open the doughnut hole for our Nation's seniors.

Mr. Speaker, before we were able to pass the health care bill, eight States and the District of Columbia in the United States considered domestic violence to be a preexisting condition and insurance companies were not required to cover victims. Are we going to go back to that if this repeal is achieved?

The majority also wants to cut financial assistance to students in need. The budget cuts Pell Grant assistance by \$83 billion over the next 10 years and allows the interest rates on need-based student loans to double. In a time when we are falling so far behind all other industrial countries in the number of persons who go to college, the United States that used to be first now is about 12th.

By all objective measures, drastic and extreme cuts such as these can be seen as unnecessary cruelty not needed to balance the budget. Indeed, just this past weekend both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL

RYAN said on Sunday television shows that this Nation does not face a debt crisis. When asked about it yesterday, Chairman RYAN indicated that, yes, he had said that.

So despite saying that to everybody, scaring America half to death, keeping businesses from being able to plan the future, they continue to promote a dystopian vision of the future in order to convince Americans that we have to adopt their extreme policies today. It is under this guise that the majority proposes their most extreme transformation of America's social safety net in today's budget.

Once again this year, the majority proposes to end Medicare as we know it and turn the promise of guaranteed health care into a voucher program. Unlike Medicare, the majority voucher program would not guarantee seniors access to the health care they need. I think we thoroughly discussed that last year when it failed and certainly during the last election when it failed. This would drive senior citizens into the market with a defined income that they could use to buy their own insurance if they were physically or mentally able to do so.

This is the same failed proposal, and it has been opposed by Americans, as I said, at the ballot box. But we continue today to defy the wishes of the American people with a quest to end Medicare as we know it, and it should be a telling reminder of where priorities lie.

These extreme cuts stand in sharp contrast to the tax reform contained within their budget. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in order to enact the majority's tax reform and to not increase the deficit, middle class families would have to pay \$3,000 more a year and the wealthiest Americans receive a \$245,000 tax break.

□ 1300

Once again, the majority has shown they would rather take away vital programs from our Nation's most vulnerable than raise a single dollar in taxes on America's wealthiest citizens.

Mr. Speaker, such a budget is neither original nor serious, nor is it acceptable to the American people. We've been down this road before, and it is discouraging and dangerous that the majority insists that we go down it yet once again. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's budget proposal and today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to refer the gentleman to the House Budget Committee report.

If she were to read just the first few pages, she would see that spending increases under this budget by \$500 billion in the next 5 years and by \$1.5 trillion over the next 10. I promised myself I would count how many times we heard the words "extreme cuts" applied to what is a half-trillion dollars in new and additional spending, but I confess I've lost track already today.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Rules Committee, a man who crafted this rule that has allowed all ideas on the budget to be considered today. He would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, who sits on the Rules Committee and who also sits on the Budget Committee and is doing an awesome job on behalf of this body and the people of Georgia.

Today, the American people have a chance, really, to see firsthand the rolling out of what we call the Ryan budget. PAUL RYAN, who is the chairman of our Budget Committee, once again leads, I believe, the intellectual thought process on talking about the future that we should have in this country. Certainly, the budget is that primer—that guiding post, that opportunity for us to lay out a philosophy about what Republicans stand for. Today, the American people are having a chance to hear from our colleagues, the Democrats.

Of course, as you listen to our colleagues—our friends, the Democrats—talk, everything about a budget, if you're a Republican, is about harming the middle class, is about ruining the country, is about our heading in the wrong direction. That is because they've taken the simple approach. They will try and fund everything; they will try and fund hospitals; they will fund airports; they will fund schools. They will do all of these amazing things, but the facts of the case are that that process and that future do not work.

Yesterday, PAUL RYAN, before the Rules Committee, very carefully argued the point that really is embodied on this slide, which talks about a responsible way forward for this country, because, you see, we have the authority and the responsibility to make sure that what we do sustains our future: that it's something that creates not only more jobs but opportunities for the future of not just ourselves but of our children and our grandchildren.

For 4 years, this House was led by Democrats, and you can see the laws that they passed and the amazing amount of spending that it would place upon our country. We don't even show in here individually where Social Security is as that will go bankrupt—Medicare, bankrupt; Medicaid, insolvent; our inability to be able to pay for our future by creating jobs today.

The free enterprise system is exactly what Republicans support and believe in because that is the American Dream—not government spending and government jobs but, rather, a vibrant free enterprise system whereby there are employers who want to hire people to become employees, to have careers, to then make this country better and stronger. The way you do that is by lowering government spending, by having a public-private partnership, not by having the Federal Government be responsible for everything from a one-

size-fits-all health care industry to the government control of every part of our lives.

So, yesterday, PAUL RYAN—very effectively, I believe—came before the House Rules Committee and talked about a vision forward. What's very interesting is that everybody else talked about let's just stick it to the rich. Let's raise taxes trillions of dollars. Let's go and stick it to special interests, like people who provide gasoline at the pump, and raise taxes on oil companies. Well, ladies and gentlemen, every time you raise taxes, you raise prices, and every time you raise prices, the consumer has to pay more for it. These are the ideas that make America less able to be prepared for its future and that cost more money.

That's why, when you look at this slide, you see where the laws already enacted by the Democrats are leading America to where we will be functionally bankrupt. We are following the European model—exactly what they have done over there for a number of years—and now we are seeing firsthand Iceland, Greece and, just yesterday, Cyprus. This is the pathway down which our friends, the Democrats, if they get their say, will lead us.

Republicans, through PAUL RYAN, spoke about we want to make sure that Medicare, that Social Security, that the free enterprise system are alive and well by making these plans and the process therein ready for the employers and the workers of tomorrow. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about reforms that will ensure the things that the American people want and need—and, yes, even at the National Institutes of Health so that they will be prepared for our future.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we're talking about today. I can't wait until PAUL RYAN and the Republicans engage Democrats on the floor with facts and figures. This is a primer to what we'll see.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee on the budget, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her continued tremendous leadership on the Rules Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule; and I think the previous speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, really laid out why I'm totally opposed to this rule and the bill.

As a member of the Budget Committee, let me just say that I've had a chance to study this GOP budget, which is full of choices that would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests, the wealthy and, yes, big oil companies—oil subsidies. It creates more income inequality, and it shreds the safety net. It is in keeping with the overall effort we've seen over and over again to dismantle government, increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this very warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a Path to Prosperity, but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children, and for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the majority did not support the amendment that I offered in the Budget Committee that would set a goal of cutting poverty in half in 10 years, which listed and reaffirmed those government-supported programs, such as the earned income tax credit, which lifts people out of poverty even though we tried to come to some agreement on language; but, quite frankly, if they supported that goal, they would have accepted my amendment, and their budget would have made some radically different choices.

The reality is we hear the rhetoric that claims to support a goal of ending poverty while at the same time making devastating cuts that put more people into poverty. The fact of the matter is you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. Blocking Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty. It will just make it worse.

When you look at this Republican budget, for example, it takes 66 percent of the budget cuts from programs for people with low or moderate incomes. It would cost 2 million jobs in 2014, and it would slash \$135 billion over 10 years by cutting 8 million to 9 million people from the SNAP program—our nutrition program, our food stamps program—which is one of the most effective anti-poverty programs in the United States.

The American people deserve more. They deserve a budget that creates jobs, a budget that creates opportunity for all, not a budget that creates more poverty. So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and to vote “no” on this budget because it is a pathway to poverty.

□ 1310

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. If I can just ask my colleague from California before she leaves, and I have the great pleasure of serving with her on the Budget Committee, and I would certainly disagree with most of her characterizations about the work product there, and look forward to dispelling those tomorrow, but today with this rule, I heard you encourage our colleagues to reject this rule. This is, of course, a rule that has made every single idea of every single Member who had a budget plan in order. Does that not satisfy the gentlelady's need for a full and open debate on our budget priorities?

Ms. LEE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'm happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I don't think I mentioned a full and open debate. What I wanted to talk about was the rule that allows for the presentation of this budget and listed all of the support programs that really keep people out of poverty. And also the fact that yes, we tried, as you know, in the committee to put together an amendment that would actually do that on a bipartisan way. But you can't ignore the fact that we need SNAP. We need food assistance for children and women. We need all of those programs.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would not ignore those at all. I believe we have made priorities of those in this budget. I look forward to debating that tomorrow.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), another one of my colleagues on the Budget Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I have the privilege, as Mr. WOODALL mentioned, of serving with him on the Budget Committee and serving with him on the Rules Committee, and being a fellow member of the Republican Study Committee with him. And I want to thank him for all he's done, quite frankly, to fashion both the Ryan budget and the RSC budget, and to bring us such an excellent rule today.

Writing a budget in the end is always about making choices. And, fortunately, this rule provides this House with multiple choices, a variety of options, and a great deal of time for debate. We'll have an opportunity to debate the budget offered by our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus. We're going to have an opportunity to debate the Progressive Caucus's budget, the Republican Study Committee's budget, and what we think will be the Senate budget—or at least as close to it as we can determine at this time. Obviously our friends on the other side of the aisle will present their substitute budget, and we'll have the underlying budget, the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican budget. So I think those are a lot of choices that this body will have to work through in the next couple of days. I'm proud that this rule allows that degree of choice and facilitates debate.

Personally, I support both the Republican Study Committee budget, and should it fail to achieve majority, the underlying Ryan budget. Both of them make tough choices. First and foremost to me, they both come into balance. Now our Republican Study Committee budget, which my friend Mr. WOODALL had more to do with than any other Member in crafting, comes in a little faster. I actually think that's a good thing. But the Ryan budget also comes into balance within 10 years. That's important not just for the sake of bookkeeping; it's important because

we all know that private sector growth depends on the confidence that taxes aren't going to continually go up, and that the public sector will remain in check.

I think by giving that kind of assurance, both of those budgets facilitate what I know all of us want, and that's the creation of more and better jobs for the American people. After all, if budgets that never balanced and record deficits got job creation, we would be coming off the four best years in modern American history because we've had four \$1 trillion deficits in a row, another that will "only be" \$850 billion this year. That has yielded us less than 2 percent growth a year. We all know if we took the number of Americans that have left the workforce and recalculated our unemployment rate, it wouldn't be 7.8 percent; it would be about 10.5 percent.

So the path that my friends on the other side recommend doesn't work, and the balance in both the RSC budget and the Ryan budget are a much more promising course. And they achieve that balance while not raising taxes. I think that's very important, too. We certainly aren't undertaxed in this country. Now my friends on the other side clearly believe that we are. They are going to offer multiple tax increases in all their budgets. I like a budget that does not require tax increases.

Finally, both these budgets, the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican budget, come to grips with the reality that we have to reform entitlements. Now we have our preferred way of doing that, but there could be others. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side are largely silent about that important choice.

As my friend, Mr. WOODALL, mentioned in his remarks, the Ryan budget in particular is hardly a radical budget. It's going to increase spending every single year over a 10-year window by about 3.5 percent. The main Democratic alternative is at about 5 percent. Can't we live at 3.5 percent and have a balanced budget in 10 years as opposed to going to 5 with higher taxes and not balance the budget within that 10-year window?

Again, I'm proud of my Democratic colleagues for joining in the debate. I appreciate the fact that they're going to put multiple budgets on the floor. I wish the President's budget was available. I'm going to assume some day it will be. It should've been here months ago, quite frankly. But sooner or later he will get it into debate.

In my view, all of the Democratic budgets are unacceptable for three very simple reasons: each and every one of them calls for much bigger government, much bigger than we've had historically, and all of them call for higher taxes. And frankly, most of them never, ever, ever balance at all—not in 10 years, not in 20, not in 30. So effectively, our friends are offering more expensive government, bigger govern-

ment, and an eternal and ever-expanding debt. I don't think that's a choice that the American people want to make.

I want to urge support of this generally excellent rule. It provides every Member of this House an opportunity to participate in this important debate. I want to urge passage of the Republican Study Committee budget, and failing that, the underlying Ryan or Republican budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for yielding me this time and rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill that essentially is the Ryan budget.

I want to say to the prior speaker that the way you balance budgets is to put people back to work. This budget, the Ryan budget, will actually cause 750,000 more people to be added to the ranks of the unemployed. When you have 12 million people in our country who've been out of work for a long time or they can't find a decent-paying job, you can't balance budgets with that level of unemployment. This is an anti-growth budget.

I want to focus my remarks, however, mainly on senior citizens and the impact of this budget on seniors. The Ryan budget turns a very cold heart to America's senior citizens. It ends the Medicare guarantee. It throws nearly 50 million Americans receiving earned health care benefits through Medicare to the cruel marketplace and rising health care prices. And it takes away the 10-year guarantee of Medicare's solvency that we passed in the Affordable Care Act. Forty-one million Americans over the age of 65 will be affected, as will 9 million disabled Americans receiving Social Security benefits. That's evidence of a cold heart.

Now the poorest citizens in America are senior women over the age of 80 years. Over half of Medicare's beneficiaries earn annual incomes of less than \$23,000. The Republican Ryan budget doesn't even see them.

The Ryan budget hurts the poorest seniors by putting senior farmer's market nutrition coupons, for example, on the chopping block. To qualify for \$50 to buy fresh fruits and vegetables, a senior has to earn less than \$15,000 a year. Now, under that budget, 863,000 more seniors will be cut off of a fragile lifeline of coupons for better nutrition. Fifty dollars.

The Ryan budget already cut a million meals for fragile seniors across this country. Now, the Ryan budget piles more harm on them.

Meanwhile, Wall Street titans, who took our Nation to the brink, have earned record bonuses, millions and millions and millions of dollars. So it's \$50 for seniors, or multibillions for those who have so much already. That's not even on the scale of justice.

The Ryan budget will cause more illness among our seniors. Seniors will be forced to pay thousands of dollars for medicines they can't afford. It will eliminate free preventive screenings for seniors for cancer and diabetes. So America will yield more illness. The Ryan budget will eliminate free annual checkups for seniors who can't afford to pay for a checkup, and it'll stop free mammograms and prostate screenings for them. It's a cold-hearted budget for seniors.

□ 1320

The Ryan budget will hurt them. It is bad for Medicare. It is bad for seniors. It's bad for our country.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this rule and the underlying budget. Stand up for America's seniors. You know, if you go to any food bank in this country, senior citizens are coming in at an increasing rate of 37 percent. Just look at the lines.

I ask every one of my Republican colleagues this weekend, when you go home, go to your food banks. Look who's in line. Ask yourself what you're going to do to fix the budget for our senior citizens across this country.

Stand up against the coldhearted Republican budget. It's really the forces of darkness at work in here. Open your eyes to what is happening across this country. Vote against this rule and vote against the underlying budget.

Stand up for the seniors of America. In every family in this country, they've earned the right to have a worry-free existence. This budget hurts them.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan budget and vote against this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to speak to accusations of forces of darkness. I've found in my time that light is one of those great illuminators. How convenient in that route.

And I would just refer folks to the budget that's posted online. It's [budget.house.gov](http://budget.house.gov).

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the budget report is there that goes through line item by line item by line item and increases spending, not by the 5 percent that current law would do it, that current law that is sending our children and our grandchildren to bankruptcy, but increases spending by 3.5 percent instead. And within that, the gentlelady from Ohio, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely right. We've got to make priority choices about where it is we want our dollars to go.

But I would say to the gentlelady—and I know her heart is pure as she talks about the investment and where she wants to make it in this country—tell me what it is that you and I are willing to pay for today, and let's make that investment.

You know, I think about Hurricane Sandy, for example, all those families in need that we wanted to help; and, you know, we didn't raise a single penny here to do it. We asked our children and our grandchildren to pay for every nickel.

I don't need encouragement to visit those food banks. I've been there already, and I know exactly what the gentlelady's talking about.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, then you've seen them in the line. You've seen the senior women in the line in all these food banks, a third of an increase, sir.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, indeed I have. I've seen our neighbors there filling those needs as well.

Again, it is so frustrating to me, Mr. Speaker, in this body, we do not argue about who are the poorest and the neediest among us. We know with certainty who those folks are. What we argue about is whether it's your and my obligation to feed and clothe those folks, or whether we should pass that obligation along to our children and our grandchildren.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it is immoral. It is immoral for us to ask our children and our grandchildren to pay bills for charity that you and I are not willing to do ourselves today.

I'm so pleased that this rule has made every idea available on the floor of the House for a vote today, but we must choose to do it ourselves. The time for passing the bill to our children and grandchildren is long gone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm pleased to yield another minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I would say to the gentleman, what you said was very, very important, because we do have choices in a budget. And you know, sir, at the food banks around this country, there isn't enough food being provided. They're absolutely at the edge. There isn't enough to go around. That's where the Government of the United States has to come in.

We can't ask our seniors to have any less meals. We can't ask our seniors to take any other nutrition cuts. There simply isn't any slack there.

Now, maybe you live in a community that's more affluent, I'm not sure. I represent three of the lowest income communities, urban areas in this country, and I see what's happening there. And you know, if you look at the amount of subsidy going out to the producers in our country, we could nick that just a little bit, and we could find the funds to help our seniors.

I would invite you to Ohio. I would invite you to see a State that still has 7 percent unemployment and what happens at these food banks. It's vitally important that we not cut help for senior citizens. There isn't any loving

child or grandchild in this country that wants to hurt their grandmother or their mother or father.

I think that your budget is misguided, and I would commend the gentleman, please look at those lines. Restore the funds I'm asking for. And I invite you to Ohio.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to say to the gentlelady, my sister and brother-in-law and two beautiful nieces live in Athens, Ohio, one of the poorest regions in southern Ohio. I know exactly what the gentlelady is saying.

We do have to make these choices, and I commend our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive budget for laying out their guidelines for raising taxes by \$4 and \$6 trillion, respectively, to try to pay for some of those priorities; but even in those budgets, they still never balance.

I'm saying that you and I today, from the great wealth that is in this country today, have a chance to either pay for things that we think are important or borrow money from our children and our grandchildren to pay for things that we think are important. You and I are closer to death than we are to birth. These bills are going to be paid by our children and our grandchildren. And today, for example, the President's budget, we've never seen a budget that projected paying back even a penny over the next 75-year window.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

I would welcome the opportunity to work closer across the aisle than we are here today to address those needs that we all agree on. I would say to the gentlelady, our disagreement is not on whether or not those needs exist; it's whether or not you and I are obligated, morally, spiritually, as a function of our community, to serve those needs or whether we can pass that bill on to others.

I know the gentlelady has a strong passion for doing that. I hope she would join with me so that we can do it together, not ask someone else to do it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman kindly yield just for a couple of seconds here—

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR.—Just to say that the first obligation is to feed the hungry, feed the hungry. And I don't think the gentleman would want to have on his conscience any harm to the senior citizens of this country, so I'd ask you to rereview your budget and fix it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank both of my colleagues. I thank the gentlelady and the manager of this rule.

I vigorously rise to oppose this rule, the underlying bill, the Republican proposal for a budget. And I really do speak from the heart, because when you go home, it is often the best time of the service to your Nation because you get to see hardworking Americans, no matter what region you live in. And so I'm very proud to associate myself and support the Van Hollen Democratic budget substitute, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The singular theme that rides through all of these budgets, which is the very question that is raised, whether or not it's a teenager coming out looking for a summer job; whether or not it's a college student with their bright, new diploma holding it up, looking for America's great opportunity; or whether it's someone who has worked for a period of time, well-qualified, but just can't find the job to get back into the market. I know there are those who are listening, my colleagues, who have constituents like that. Every single budget, including the Van Hollen budget, the Democratic budget, helps to create jobs, gets rid of the sequester and, in actuality, brings back the 775,000 or 750,000 jobs lost by the Ryan budget, plus more.

The Congressional Black Caucus focuses on maintenance for public transit and highway and airports, creating jobs. The Congressional Progressive Caucus focuses on making work pay and emergency unemployment compensation.

But here's the story that I think is under the underlying Ryan budget—good friend of ours, of course, we work together—and the underlying premise.

I am tired of raising up the generational fight. Just because the Greatest Generation fought in World War II, are we to say to our children and grandchildren, "You know what, we don't want to burden you when the military calls you, when your Nation needs you; we don't want to burden you?"

□ 1330

There's no way to protect what our grandchildren and children will have with this budget, other than the fact that the Democratic budget invests in people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you have a preschool program, when you have programs that transition women out of their homes after raising their children and into jobs, when you have a program that allows young people with a college degree to get a job, when you have programs that invest in infrastructure and build highways and bridges that America is begging for—like the Hoover Dam—that our grandchildren and children will receive in



America, that we invested in, they'll receive a gift. And they'll be able to work with their hands and their minds, and they will have the ability to pay down any debts and they'll close any deficit. And they'll be grateful to do it, because America will be the greatest Nation that it can.

Don't constantly pound us with our grandchildren and our children. Right now, today, America can afford to pay for what we are doing in the Van Hollen Democratic budget because we are creating jobs, we're building infrastructure, we're making America greater—the very America that people around the world admire.

So I want to vote for a growth budget. I want to vote for one that reduces unemployment under 5 percent. I want to vote for one that lifts America so that our children and grandchildren will have the benefit of all that we've done for them, and they'll have the benefit of paying for what America promises.

Vote for America's promise. Vote against the Ryan budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to a new member of the Rules Committee, but a senior member and leader of this House, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and certainly thank him for leading this rule on the floor this afternoon.

This is an important vote we're going to have today. The rule that will bring various budgets to the floor is a very fair product. As the gentleman knows, as we sat through the hours of debate in the Rules Committee last night, this is not just the product of the Budget Committee that is coming to the floor. It's not just Chairman RYAN's budget that is coming to the floor. But these are budgets that have been proposed by a number of different groups within the Congress—the Congressional Black Caucus, the Progressive Caucus, the Democratic substitute, the Senate budget is going to be offered as a substitute, where people can vote, and the Republican Study Committee. At the end of all that time, if none of the budgets receive the majority vote in the House of Representatives, then and only then will the product of the Budget Committee be voted on by the entire House. My expectation is that that is the budget that will pass.

But our argument here today is not over what is contained within the Budget Committee's product anymore than it is what's contained within the Progressive's budget product. After all, what we're voting on today is the rule that will allow us the ability to debate these differences in philosophy on the floor of this House tomorrow, on C-SPAN, transparent for all the country to see; and they'll be able to see the big philosophical differences that exist.

We heard in the Rules Committee last night that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House

for a vote because the Senate budget has not been voted on on the floor of the Senate and that obstructionist Republicans in the Senate will keep the Senate from voting; but, actually, that's not true. The Senate, under its own rules, can bring the budget to the floor of the Senate and pass it with a simple majority. That's a 50-plus-1 majority. There's not enough Republicans in the Senate to block that or any other budget.

So the discussion that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House to vote on before the Senate has a chance to vote, the Senate could have voted on their budget at any time. The Senate could have voted last year for a budget. The Senate could have voted the year before for a budget. They chose not to because they did not want to put it out for the American people to see what their core philosophical belief is, which is that you have to raise taxes by a trillion dollars on the American people in order to pass a budget.

We hear it time and time again that the greatest antipoverty program in this country is a job. The growth that is provided for in the budget that will be debated upon—and I hope pass tomorrow—we can't discount the importance of that growth.

I just came from a hearing in the Energy Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce. We were fortunate to hear from one of the members of the Railroad Commission in Texas. The Railroad Commission doesn't have anything to do with trains anymore. It has all to do with energy. And Commissioner Smitherman from Texas was at the committee hearing, and I asked him a question. I said, In the Ryan budget that we will hear about tomorrow, there is an estimate of \$11 billion over the next 10 years that will be paid to the Federal Government because of development of oil and natural gas on Federal lands. I said, I'm from Texas. That number seems a little bit light to me. I would expect the amount of revenue produced on Federal lands from oil and gas production, assuming we don't legislate it out of existence through the Environmental Protection Agency. And he said, In Texas, the 2-year budget figure for oil and gas severance taxes is \$7 billion.

Well, that would be a significantly greater amount than the \$11 billion estimated in the Ryan budget. I asked Mr. RYAN about this last night at the Rules Committee. This is the amount that is allowed under Congressional Budget Office expectations. But, honestly, if we free up the energy that we have available within our own shores, within our own borders, that is a jobs program that would go a long way towards producing that unemployment rate of 5 percent that the gentlelady from Texas just referenced.

I know this because in the district that I represent in north Texas, gas production from a geologic formation known as the Barnett shale has yielded

significant economic benefits and significant employment as a result. In fact, when the Nation entered into a recession in December of 2007, constituents in my district basically read about it in the newspapers because it wasn't until 12, 13, or 14 months later when the price of natural gas came down so low that we actually felt the recession in Texas.

So let's utilize that energy that's at our disposal. Life without energy is cold, brutal, and short. We have the ability to produce energy on our own shores. One of the things where I think we can look to the Ryan budget for leadership is allowing that energy to be produced on Federal lands.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May I inquire from my colleague if he has further requests.

Mr. WOODALL. I will say to the gentlelady I do not have further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. In closing, Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues and I have spoken at length today about the dangerous shortcomings of the budget proposal of Mr. RYAN. Fortunately, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has an alternative proposal that significantly reduces the Nation's deficit while creating jobs and protecting programs like Medicaid and Medicare. And unlike the majority's proposal, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget repeals the sequester, which is estimated to cost the Nation 750,000 jobs this year.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has repeatedly tried to avert the sequester. He has come to the Rules Committee numerous times with proposals to replace the sequester with responsible budget cuts and has been repeatedly denied the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the House floor.

By voting for Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, every Member of this Chamber can vote to do away with the sequester. On behalf of the thousands of Americans who are facing pay cuts, furloughs, and job losses, I urge my colleagues to repeal the sequester today and vote to balance the budget in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, while the majority would like you to believe that a looming debt crisis is imminent, it is simply not true. Even this last weekend, both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN said on television there is no immediate budget crisis facing our Nation. Please think of that, my colleagues, as you vote.

In acknowledging this reality, it is important to realize that it is possible to make investments in our economy today, create jobs, repeal the sequester, and still reduce our deficit in a responsible and balanced way.

In closing, I urge my colleagues not to be scared by the rhetoric that sometimes we hear. Instead, I urge my colleagues to support one of the multiple

budget proposals that reduce our deficit responsibly while creating jobs today and protecting the important programs like Medicaid and Medicare for generations to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentlelady for being with me on the floor today.

I'll say that we sometimes have some controversy in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. There's a lot of responsibility that lies in the Rules Committee. With 435 folks here in this Chamber, and we all would like to have our say—and we'd all like to have our say probably more than once—the Rules Committee is tasked with managing that debate.

I'll tell you, I think the rule we passed last night is the best rule we've done all year along. Now, my colleague from New York may think I'm damming it with faint praise. But I would say that having this open debate that we will have tomorrow on budgets is about the best we can do in this institution, Mr. Speaker. To allow every single idea, every single individual from the most junior Member who was just elected 2 months ago to the most senior Member who has been here 40 years, if you have a budget idea, you get to have it heard on the floor of the House. In this case, Mr. Speaker, that's going to be six budgets we're going to look at tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe having an open process is important. We made in order the Progressive Caucus budget. That Progressive Caucus budget raises taxes by \$5.7 trillion—unashamed, unabashed. Tough economy; let's raise taxes by \$5.7 trillion, and let's increase spending even more than we are today. I'm glad that that budget is going to be here on the floor. The Congressional Black Caucus raises taxes \$4.2 trillion. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute raises taxes \$1.2 trillion.

As you saw from the chart that the chairman of the Rules Committee had on the floor of the House earlier, Mr. Speaker, we don't have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem in this country. If we took everything from everybody, we still wouldn't have enough money to pay for all of the promises that previous Congresses and previous Presidents have made. What that translates into is fear.

We can do better for the American people than election after election to scare them with the looming bankruptcy of programs that they depend on. Yet we know the Social Security Disability Insurance program—already out of money, Mr. Speaker. The Medicare program—which my mom and dad depend on—going out of business in 2023. The Social Security retirement program, Mr. Speaker, not enough money to fund future promises. We

have a chance to either ignore those promises or embrace those challenges.

I will tell you we do not have a crisis in this country; we have an opportunity in this country to do the things that we have long known we needed to do.

In 1983, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats came together, extended the life of the Social Security program and provided certainty and security to another generation of America's seniors. We have an opportunity tomorrow to do the same thing for the Medicare program, or to kick the can down the road and ensure uncertainty, crisis, and fear in yet another generation of Americans who depend upon these programs.

I urge all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule that will allow every single idea to be considered tomorrow. And when you come to the floor tomorrow, choose that budget that makes the tough decisions.

It takes no courage at all to let someone else pay the bills, Mr. Speaker. It takes no courage at all to let the next generation sort out the problems. The courage is coming together today to say, even though the weight is going to fall on our shoulders to solve the problem, we owe it to the next generation. We owe them nothing less.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 122; adopting House Resolution 122, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 122) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]  
YEAS—223

Alexander	Coffman	Gibbs
Amash	Cole	Gibson
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Conaway	Gohmert
Barletta	Cook	Goodlatte
Barr	Cotton	Gosar
Barton	Cramer	Gowdy
Benishek	Crawford	Granger
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Billirakis	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Blackburn	Denham	Guthrie
Bonner	Dent	Hall
Boustany	DeSantis	Hanna
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harris
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Buchanan	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Farenthold	Holding
Burgess	Fincher	Hudson
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Camp	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Fleming	Hultgren
Cantor	Forbes	Hunter
Capito	Fox	Hurt
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Issa
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Chabot	Gardner	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Gerlach	Jones