

**PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS**

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 122, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the resolution is considered as read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

*Resolved,*

**SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$10,072,374; Committee on Armed Services, \$13,127,070; Committee on the Budget, \$10,277,648; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$13,905,526; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$19,041,032; Committee on Ethics, \$6,040,918; Committee on Financial Services, \$14,788,964; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$14,776,224; Committee on Homeland Security, \$14,067,176; Committee on House Administration, \$9,201,120; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$8,779,516; Committee on the Judiciary, \$14,154,032; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,111,658; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$17,880,874; Committee on Rules, \$5,714,816; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,565,510; Committee on Small Business, \$5,985,376; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$16,364,614; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$6,097,092; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$16,846,822.

**SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2013, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2014.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, \$6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, \$5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, \$3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, \$4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$8,940,437; Committee on Rules, \$2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,282,755; Committee on Small

Business, \$2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,423,411.

**SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2014, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2015.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, \$6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, \$5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, \$3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, \$4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$8,940,437; Committee on Rules, \$2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,282,755; Committee on Small Business, \$2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,423,411.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2014, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

**SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.**

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

**SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.**

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

**SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) BALANCE.—The balance of the reserve fund under this section shall be equal to the sum of the following:

(1) The amount by which the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2013 exceeds the amount that would be made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" by division C of the

Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (H.R. 933, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013), as reduced pursuant to the provisions of division D of such Act.

(2) The amount by which the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2014 exceeds the amount made available for "House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select" for fiscal year 2013.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

**SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.**

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of House Resolution 115, which is providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress and which authorizes committee budgets for the 113th Congress.

Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration held two very lengthy and very informative days of hearings with our chairmen and with our ranking members from all of the 19 House committees. Each of them testified about their respective budgets, the commitment to uphold the longstanding two-thirds, one-third allocation between majority and minority offices; and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, they talked about doing more with less, which is a topic that we are all very, very familiar with.

This funding process and these discussions significantly impact the legislative process as these committees are where, of course, the legislation that comprise much of our work begins, where our vital oversight functions occur, which is why throughout this process we adhered, Mr. Speaker, to two very important principles. First of all, we said we need to live within our means, and then prioritizing the finite resources that we have provided to us

in the Congress by hardworking American taxpayers.

As we all know, sequestration went into effect on March 1, 2013, and Congress must live with further cuts, just as every other agency of government must live with similar cuts. As a result of the sequester, the total committee authorization level must be reduced by approximately 11 percent, in the 11 percentile range. And that means if we authorize above that amount, then we will have to take the money from somewhere else.

When ensuring that committees have adequate resources, obviously, we have to consider their legislative objectives; we have to consider their anticipated workload and authorize the finite resources available in a way that best suits the needs of the House of Representatives as a whole.

Although the sequestration is not certainly the ideal way to cut spending, cuts are imperative. They must happen. Our government is too big, too involved, and too costly. As those who are charged with the care of taxpayers' dollars, we need to lead by example, and we must control our spending. We must live within our own means.

Now, this may be a far more strict budget than many had hoped or anticipated, but like so many Americans, we are coping with our circumstances, and we are making cuts to our budgets in a way that any American business or American family would have to, as every local unit of government, every State around the country has had to do. Certainly during these very trying economic times, we also have to make value judgments and budget accordingly.

To match the available post-sequestration funding level, the total authorization amount for House committees must be reduced, as I say, by about 11 percent from the 2012 level; and, therefore, with very few exceptions, each committee authorization has been reduced, again, within that 11 percent range or certainly within a percentage point or so of the 11 percent.

Based on the anticipated workload for the 113th Congress, the Budget Committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Select Committee on Intelligence have been given very much smaller reductions, a very slight reduction from the 11 percent. But every committee certainly will be faced with important oversight responsibilities for 2013. However, given that getting our economy moving again and defending this Nation are the foremost priorities that we face, the dire need for tax and entitlement reform to help grow our economy, to create good-paying private sector jobs and the increasing cyberthreats to our digital infrastructure, it was determined by our committee that these three committees certainly are the tip of the spear in doing some of the most important work for the American people.

We must remain, as well, committed to leading by example in cutting gov-

ernment waste, rooting out inefficiencies, and conducting essential and efficient oversight of our vast administrative agencies.

House Resolution 115, Mr. Speaker, we believe fulfills that mission. I would also point out that this House resolution not only reduces committee expenditures, but it also authorizes total committee funding for the 113th Congress at a level which is lower than 2005. I think that bears repeating—a level lower than 2005. By comparison, overall nondefense discretionary spending by the executive branch has actually increased 16.7 percent since 2008—quite a big difference there.

As I said before, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I certainly understand the challenges of stretching committee resources, and I have a very deep appreciation for every committee's ability to absorb these cuts and their commitment to functioning at a high level, even with the reduced resources that they have, and that is due certainly in no small measure to the outstanding leadership that we have with each committee chairman and each ranking member on all of our committees, really, all committed to delivering a very high level of service to the American people.

Some of my colleagues, I know, have voiced their opposition to this measure calling for a freeze in committee spending. They say that freezing spending for committees at 2012 levels is a more balanced approach. But since sequestration, we just don't have the money to cover a freeze. We do not have the money.

So I would simply state that spending beyond our means, in my opinion, is not a balanced approach. In fact, I would say it's a bit irresponsible. As I said before, every American family, every small business, every State and local unit of government must live within their means, and so must the U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, again, this resolution has required us to make some very difficult but very necessary decisions. And I want to personally thank, and certainly all of our committee members thank, each chairman and each ranking member who testified before our committee, and our committee staffs as well, who are often unrecognized for the vital work that they do.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 115, living within our means and prioritizing our finite resources like the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 115 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 115 represents the next step in a slow march towards making House committees incapable of conducting the over-

sight with which they are charged and further limiting the power of this equal branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, with these cuts, we are not talking about the loss of new equipment, the next computer, or printer. No. With these cuts, we are talking about gutting our capacity to do the jobs we were sent here to do by the American people. The work product of our committees is only as good as the talented men and women that we are able to employ. And they are very able.

The House is lucky to have such a well-seasoned and skilled group of individuals carrying out the people's business. In fact, this is one of the things we always agree on—the quality of the people that work in these committees. It is at the highest level. But for how long?

If this resolution passes, there will be a 21.3 percent reduction in funding for committees since the 111th Congress. More appalling is the 26 percent cut the Judiciary Committee will sustain during the same time, particularly as they move forward to address comprehensive immigration reform that we all seem to agree on now and the initiatives to reduce gun violence.

As the chairman of the Rules Committee stated last week when he testified before our committee, "We do not have something we can cut or manage on a moving forward basis. We have by and large taken ourselves down to the bare bones." Now we're down to the bare bones. Repeatedly, we heard from committee chairs that the only thing they have left to cut are personnel expenses.

The Veterans' Affairs chairman stated, "We have no choice but to find these savings in our personnel budget."

And the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said:

We want to make certain that those individuals who will make a sacrifice and come up here and work for a reduced wage will stay with us. There is a question of how long, deeply, we can cut.

Of course there is a question, and I think the question is before us.

The chairs and ranking members of the House have been responsible stewards—we have heard that already—and they have been. And they have achieved incredible savings. But this resolution's lack of funding also hurts our ability to find governmentwide cost savings.

In fact, it does just the opposite. The committees conduct oversight over billions and billions of dollars of Federal spending and have found savings within their respective agencies. However, without high quality people that have the institutional knowledge and expertise, they will sacrifice the ability to perform strong, responsible oversight.

The chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee illustrated this best when testifying about the savings his auditors were able to provide the government. He stated:

Cutting back for us is, in fact, an opportunity to lose the very auditors that will

guarantee you multiple savings. We would like to work with the committee to allow us and other committees to find similar savings. But we must ask that you not allow the audit committee to be reduced when, in fact, we can return you more than 1,000 times our budget.

One thousand times. In Mark, it is only 100 times. Fourfold in other parts of the Bible. Here is 1,000 times.

Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have embraced the idea of doing more with less. We have all grappled with the idea of not filling empty positions, denying requests for travel and forgoing necessary technology upgrades in our offices. But there is a point where additional cuts undermine our ability to do our jobs effectively.

Based upon the testimony that we have received during our committee funding hearings, I believe that there is a bipartisan agreement that this funding resolution could represent that breaking point. In the end, the American people will be the ultimate victims.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield as much time as he may consume to an outstanding member of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 115, but I appreciate, quite honestly, the concerns just raised. And let me try to address some of them, if not all of them.

There are victims in this country, for sure. But the real victimization will occur if this House, if this Congress, if this President does not get ahold of the deficit and debt situation that we are incurring. Right now, we are in the middle of debating different budgets, the priorities that we have as parties, as Americans, et cetera.

On the one hand, we have a budget that balances in 10 years—radical for this town. On the other side, we have budgets that never, ever balance. If we don't get ahold of these deficits so we can finally start attacking the debt, and if we continue to leave to future generations our bills—to me, Mr. Speaker, the most immoral thing I can think of, really, that we can do in civic life is to leave our bills for future generations to pay. There will be the victimization.

Yes, we are going to have a hard time at the committee level, and certainly even with our MRAs that have been cut in the past, to try to do our work. But what I heard in these committee hearings from our chairman and our ranking members each is that they pledge to continue their legislative and oversight activities despite these budget cuts. So there is not going to be any victimization here with this House resolution.

The other thing this House resolution does is finally lets us lead by ex-

ample, Mr. Speaker. How can we have a national family discussion? How can we have a discussion about the morality of leaving our bills for future generations to pay if we are not willing to suck some of it up ourselves? And, yes, we are doing it. Do you know who else is doing it? The military.

I would like to say here on the floor of the House that those excuses should now be taken off the table. We are leading by example in what we have cut through our MRAs already and this House resolution. And guess what? So has the military.

Let's finally get to a discussion and action, more importantly, regarding the real drivers of our debt—the social entitlement programs of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And, yes, many of our constituents will say, Hey, wait a minute. Don't call those social entitlement programs. We paid into those, therefore, we should get out. And that is true. But what is also true is that on average—let's take Medicare, for example, Mr. Speaker—we are paying in about 40 percent, again, on average, of what we are taking out. It is immoral, wrong, to let that 60 percent get paid for by people who don't even yet exist and, therefore, don't have a say in the matter.

House Resolution 115 lets us lead by example so that we can finally get to the rest of the conversation about the drivers of our debt. Guess what else? The interest we owe ourselves as private citizens—and, more increasingly, other countries like China, countries that don't necessarily have our best interest at heart, nor should they have to have our best interest at heart—we are paying more to them in interest because of this debt than we are spending on homeland security, education, and roads combined.

That breeds weakness, that fosters instability, that creates victimization. House Resolution 115 will give us the moral authority and the real authority to continue having this discussion, to lead by example, which is so well needed in this country right now at this time. The fact of the matter is, we shouldn't have to have oversight of the budgets of the executive branch if the executive branch and this President were to lead and recognize the debt that we are in, the deficits that we run, and rein in his own people, rein in his own organizations, create a culture of doing more with less.

□ 1520

As it has been famously stated by a former Governor in Indiana: people will never miss the government that has been cut.

It goes without saying, with regard to individualism, people can do more for themselves and people can do more for each other than any faraway Federal Government program can. Let's continue leading by example. Let's continue this fiscal fight that we are engaged in. Let's pass—let's strongly support—House Resolution 115.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on the committee. I am pleased he is managing this bill today. It's good for the next generation of Members to learn the procedures of the floor this way—putting them right in the line of fire.

I would also like to thank the chairman for how she handled our marathon hearings. I've had her job and know how difficult it is to be juggling the schedules of all our fellow Members and of our fellow chairmen and ranking members.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, though, in opposition to this resolution. We have cut committee funding for the last 3 years. We are past the point of cutting what we want, and we are now into cutting what we need—our ability to attract and retain expert staff.

I asked the same question to every ranking member and every chairman who came in front of us. I asked them, if they're into cutting their personnel, whether or not they've thought in their own minds if it would hurt them in the jobs that they could do and in the jobs they do for the American people on those committees. Every man and woman said it would be an issue for them, that they would have a problem. Again, we cut in 2012 and gave people positions at lower salaries. These people, without question, make double, triple, four times the amount of money they can in the public sector. They're dedicated—they're dedicated people—but sometimes dedication doesn't pay the bills that they do acquire and that they do have.

Their main concern was keeping people on their staffs who had institutional knowledge, people who had the knowledge of how this House works. As you all know, when you first get here, it can be a quagmire—you don't understand what's happening; it moves too fast—but these men and women who are here for many years, they do know that, and they keep this train running. To hurt them and not be able to retain them would be a major, major disservice with just the institutional knowledge that they have.

Again, I get it. I understand the cutting. I understand we've got to cut some other people, but if we cut these staff members—the people who have been here—and try to attract other people who can do the jobs that our committee staffs do, I think that it would be hurting the American people.

We need to defeat this resolution and give the committees the appropriate resources that they need to do their basic work and to do what the people sent us here to do.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fact of the matter is that this is all the money that we have to spend.

Believe me, I am sympathetic to the arguments that it would be nice if our committees didn't have to make any cuts. Again, if we don't make some cuts because of the sequestration, this money has to come from somewhere else. I guess we're sort of looking for other ideas of offsets for those who are saying that we should not pass this resolution.

What kinds of things would they offset?

We've certainly watched the White House close tours to groups because they said the sequester impacted the Secret Service's ability to protect the President when the American people came into the White House. I don't know if they're suggesting we should close the Capitol Building or what have you. I don't think that kind of suggestion would go very far.

But, again, where do you offset if you're not going to cut any spending here?

I will also say this: I come from southeast Michigan, which arguably was ground zero during the most painful economic transition, certainly in my lifetime, that happened in our Nation here recently, and we're trying to get ourselves out of that. We were number one in all of the categories you didn't want to be number one in. If I'd have told our local county or our local units of government that they'd have to cut 11 percent, they would say thank you, because they've cut anywhere from 30 to 40 percent. There were just incredible amounts of cuts that happened. Furloughs have happened with employees. That has been going on for years, actually. That's my neighborhood.

When we think about the amount of borrowing that we're doing as a Nation—as everybody knows, we are now to the point of \$16 trillion in national debt with no end in sight, and we've been running deficits for, certainly, the last 5 years of well over \$1 trillion and, in many cases, \$1.5 trillion annually, and we're borrowing 42 cents on every dollar that we spend—if we do not have the political will to make any kind of cuts ourselves to where we can't even cut our own committee budgets here in the House while these kinds of cuts are being absorbed by other areas, I just think that this resolution will be a very vivid demonstration of the differences of what we think “leading by example” actually means.

I will tell you as well, as a grandmother, I do not want to look at my two little grandchildren and say, Hey, do you mind paying the bill, because I don't have the political will. I just can't do it. Too hard for me. I don't want to break a sweat here. Would you mind paying?

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I just cannot get to that place. I think this resolution is very, very important. I recognize the painful cuts that are happening. It's not easy. That's why the American people sent us here—to have the political will and to make the hard

decisions. I would hope that my colleagues would support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Democratic whip and the former ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I heard the gentlelady from Michigan's comments. I have three grandchildren of my own and two great grandchildren. The gentlelady said we don't want to turn to them and say, We don't want to pay our bills. You pay them.

That's what we did in '01 and '03. We cut revenues. We cut revenues deeply. We didn't cut spending—we increased spending—on the theory that the people who were going to get the benefit were voting and that the people who were going to get paid and who were going to have to pay the bill weren't voting. It worked to some degree; but we didn't pay, as the gentlelady suggested we ought to, our bills. As the gentlelady probably knows, we had a provision in place which said we ought to pay as we go. If we buy a war, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a tax cut, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a prescription drug, we ought to pay for it and not ask my children or my grandchildren or your children or your grandchildren to pay for it. I agree with the lady, but that's what we've done.

Now we are about the process of undermining the people's government by slashing its funding so it cannot provide the services that the people want and need and vote for, and now we will slash the ability of this House to do what the people expect us to do. I'm sorry the former Secretary of State left the Chamber. He's the Secretary of State. He says we ought to lead by example. By golly, I'll tell you: the people in my constituency, they hope we're not the example of how to work. They hope we're not the example of the dysfunction that they ought to follow, that we're not the example of “do it my way or no way,” which is what we've been doing.

The people of the United States of America send us here, and they want us to make sure that we adopt policies that will help them and their families, that will create jobs and grow our economy. That's what they want. What the people of the United States also want is to make sure we can conduct the oversight of their government. That's our responsibility. The previous gentleman said, Well, the executive ought to lead, and then we wouldn't need to do oversight. I didn't get that, frankly, at all. The executive is a separate and equal branch of government, but we are the first branch of govern-

ment. We are article I. We are the people's House. We represent the people, and they expect us to make sure their government is operating properly. To the extent that year after year we reduce our ability to conduct the oversight necessary to ensure that the people's government is operating consistent with law and on behalf of the people of the United States—to the extent that we undermine that ability—we undermine free government, a free people, a free country.

□ 1530

We undermine the ability of this government to make sure that the executive is doing the right thing. And to the extent that the population of this country keeps growing, as it does every year, it needs us to be on the job. And what we're saying, of course, is: Well, we have a sequester. Sequester starts with “S”; it stands for stupid. It is an irrational policy that we've adopted. And we've adopted it. It just didn't happen. It didn't come out of the air. It didn't fall from the trees. We adopted sequester. It's an irrational, ineffective, inefficient, negative policy that we've not only allowed to go into place, but in the budget we passed, we adopted it one more time, not by mistake but by policy. It was a bad policy. I didn't vote for it. It's irrational.

I tell people around the country, you know, it's like the family has a budget. You have a food budget and you have a movie budget. Somebody loses their job and so your income goes down. So what you do is you sit around the table and say: We'll cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent. What rational human being would do that? Nobody. They'd say we're not going to go to the movies this month so we can put food on the table and make sure that our family is well fed.

But that's not what we're doing. The sequester that we're now pursuing, somewhat mindlessly, in my opinion, with respect to our ability to do the job that the people expect us to do, is to cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent.

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

Mr. VARGAS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My friends, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I want the American people to know we've cut committee funding for 2 years in a row because we understand that we're asking everybody to notch in their belt by one or two notches, and we ought to do the same. And we have. But if you undermine the people's ability to do their job, you're going to be in trouble.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote: “Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition.”

That's what we are here, we're on public exhibition. The TV is on, people are watching us, and people are seeing us.

But what Woodrow Wilson also said was: “Whilst Congress in committee rooms is Congress at work.”

That's where we really do our work. We vote on it here, but committees are critically important creatures of oversight and of action.

I think the gentlelady is a good Member of this House, and she's been given a tough responsibility. She laments the fact that we have no money. We have no money because we said we didn't need it; we have no money because we can operate government without it.

Mr. Speaker, I hear your gavel, and I will close, but I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's make sure that the Congress of the United States can do the job that the people expect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this committee funding bill, which would hurt the ability of Congress to do its work effectively.

This bill would cut the funding for House Committees by an additional 11% in order to meet the irrational demands of sequestration—on top of huge cuts imposed last Congress.

Committees have lost around a quarter of their funding in the past few years, and this has meant fewer staff positions and the possibility of furloughs.

Most, I think, do not realize just how important committees are to the work we perform on the American people's behalf.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote:

Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee-rooms is Congress at work.

Eroding the ability of committees to do their work seriously limits the ability of Congress to engage in the people's work.

The Speaker and majority leader have said many times that this House ought to follow regular order.

To do so, we must have strong and fully functioning committees.

I urge my colleagues in both parties to oppose this bill.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minority whip's comments. I have great regard for him as well. I thought it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, listening to him talk about the President's sequester as an irrational kind of a thing. Of course, it was the President's idea. I don't dispute that it is not the best way to cut spending. Many may say it's an irrational approach. Again, the President's sequester, the President's idea.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Just so we're pretty accurate, as the gentlelady knows, your side offered a bill which was called Cut, Cap, and Balance. The alternative in Cut, Cap, and Balance was sequester. I didn't vote for that. I'm not sure how the gentlelady voted on it. It passed this House overwhelmingly with Republican support and with opposition on our side before Jack Lew suggested to HARRY REID that that might be one way to get off the lack of action in making sure that America paid its bills. The only reason I interrupt the gentlelady is because I think it is important to understand that your Cut,

Cap, and Balance, passed before that suggestion was made, included sequester as the fallback if we didn't reach the numbers. If it's the President's, it's the President's via Cut, Cap, and Balance which your side of the aisle passed and sent to the Senate as presumably good policy.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding. She was very kind to do that.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for pointing out the sequencing of the sequester, the President's sequester, the President's idea of the sequester, and I appreciate that. I still say with the President's sequester that what's going to happen with this vote is a very vivid demonstration, again, of who is actually committed to doing more with less. My colleague, the gentleman, the minority whip, also has given us sort of a historical lesson of various things in his observation of the way things had gone earlier on, and I would point something out as well since we are talking about committee budget cuts.

In 2007 when the other party, the Democrats, took control of this House, they immediately increased the amount of spending on committees by 8.9 percent, almost 9 percent; immediate increase. Then in 2009 as they kept control of the Congress, again they increased committee spending, that time by 8.9 percent. Now keep in mind, this was at a time—which I had mentioned previously, being from southeast Michigan—everybody else, it seemed like, certainly every State government, every local unit of government, every school district, many, many businesses, certainly American families, were making cuts. That was not happening here with committee spending.

In 2010, this House shifted control. The Republicans took control. And what did we do with committee spending as a way to show that we wanted to do more with less, that we understood that we needed to get a handle on this out-of-control Federal spending, we actually cut committee budgets by 9.5 percent for the 112th Congress, and as we are debating now, another 11 percent cut that we're looking at.

This is at the same time that the House, under Republican control, has also cut what we call our Members' representational allowances, our MRAs, which has been very painful for all of us as well. We cut 5 percent, then in the 6 percentile. Now just a couple of weeks ago, effective immediately with the sequester, another in the 8 percentile cuts for all of us. All of us are doing more with less. And believe me, I understand there's no sympathy for Members of Congress, but I certainly point that out.

At the same time if you look at non-defense discretionary for the executive branch, almost a 17 percent increase during that same time. So I just think when we look at this resolution, we see how important it is. Again, I am not minimizing how painful it will be for

the committees, but it's really the new reality, I think, and it's important for those of us here in the people's House to do the people's work with the amount of money that we have available, and to do it to the very best of our ability. And I know certainly Republicans and Democrats are committed to doing that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were in Rules last night when I made the statement that I'm going to make here today. When I was a child, I learned that you can be penny-wise and pound foolish.

What winds up happening here is for a protracted period of time, we have not been able to retain the kind of staff, the hardworking people that really do the grinding work in committees, as Mr. HOYER pointed out, and we leave them without the ability to get a raise. And I don't know about you all, but what's going to wind up happening with my staff is some of them are going to get better jobs because they are better served by going into the private sector.

If we want to retain good people, we have to pay good people. And at a time when the public is more aware of what we are doing and making more demands, as rightly they should upon us, we decide to put ourselves in a position to not be able to serve the public.

In the final analysis, some of what we are doing is trying to save our Republican colleagues. They get two-thirds of whatever it is that we're talking about. But we should not be ashamed of what we do here. We deserve the honesty that we would want the American public to expect of us as we conduct our work.

□ 1540

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I'd like to thank the chairwoman from the committee. She was very gracious during the committee hearing, and I learned quite a bit from her. I want to thank her for that.

And I, in particular, want to thank the ranking member. The ranking member gave me the opportunity to speak here. That normally doesn't happen to freshmen, and I really appreciate that. He has a reputation of being very gracious and kind, and I appreciate it. It was certainly demonstrated here today.

I do have to respond, however. There was the issue of immorality that was brought up before, and as a former Jesuit, I'm very comfortable with that type of language. And I believe it was said that leaving bills for other generations, future generations, was the most

immoral thing we can do. I certainly would challenge that premise. I think there's a lot more immoral things that we can do. However, when you do take a look at the issue of immorality and saying that we're going to leave this huge deficit, this huge debt to future generations, I think that that is immoral.

However, it's interesting, the argument on the other side is just simply the argument of cuts and not revenue. So, for example, corporate jets, there are loopholes for them now. We could close them. It wouldn't hurt the millionaires and the billionaires to pay taxes on them. It wouldn't hurt them one bit. And that, of course, would cut—it would cut the debt, the deficit that we leave to these future generations, reducing the immorality. We could have the wealthy, instead of paying 12, 13 percent on average, pay what middle class people pay. That certainly would cut the debt and deficit significantly, reducing, once again, the immorality.

But it's interesting, talking about immorality. The Bible certainly speaks to that. In Amos, the prophet Amos, if you look it up, you'll see that Amos speaks about the anawim, and the anawim are God's little ones. The little ones, then, were the orphans and the widows. Because of the condition that they were in, it was very difficult for them to survive. And we then, or at that time, the Israelites, were going to be judged on how they treated the anawim.

That carries forward into the New Testament. If you look in Matthew, Matthew 25, they say: How are we going to be judged? How are we going to be judged?

Jesus makes it easy. He says: whatever you do to the least of my brothers, you did to me. Then he goes through a litany of things. He says: when I was hungry, you gave me to eat; when I was thirsty, you gave me to drink; when I was a stranger—interestingly, when I was a stranger, we're certainly having that conversation with immigrants today—when I was a stranger, you welcomed me; when I was ill, you cured me. Interestingly, too, when I was a prisoner, you came and visited me. It didn't say if you were innocent, by the way. It didn't say that. It said: when I was a prisoner, you came and you visited me. That's how we're going to be judged.

And these budgets, these budgets should go towards those values. That's what's moral, taking care of those that are thirsty and hungry, those that are strangers. And these committees work hard to make sure that happens, and they do a very good job. In fact, no one's argued that they don't; just the opposite. What we have heard from the committee chairs is: don't cut us because we can do even a better job. And not only that, you're loading the work on us.

So I would conclude, and again thank the ranking member and certainly

thank the chair for the opportunity. And I would urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I appreciate the opportunity, again.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, at this time, to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I've listened to this debate. It's primarily about the amount of money we spend on our committees here in the House. Taxes have just been inserted into it, and I have to respond to the comment about corporate taxes or tax breaks for corporate jets. It's an easy target. It's something the Democrats have repeatedly targeted in their budget resolution, something the President proposed to offset sequestration. And of course, the wealthy, with their big fancy corporate jets or corporate executives with their jets are easy targets.

But there is a lot of collateral damage any time this issue comes up. We forget about the people who fly those planes, the people who clean the planes, the people who fuel the planes, the people who run the facilities where those planes are hangared, the people who manage the flight operations, the people who manufacture those planes, which is, I would point out, the number one export industry in the State of Arkansas.

Much like in 1990 when the budget deal targeted the yacht industry in New England for a special luxury tax, it didn't raise the revenue that was projected. It did devastate that industry, leading to catastrophic layoffs, and resulted in the repeal of that measure within just a matter of months after it passed.

So while I appreciate the Democrats' desire to raise taxes every few months, I think that our spending crisis, or our debt crisis, is driven by spending, and we should be careful about singling out specific industries that provide good, high-paying jobs to hardworking Americans.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I certainly want to thank Mr. VARGAS for controlling his time. Mr. Speaker, he did a very good job. We certainly welcome him to the committee and look forward to working with him, as we also thank the ranking member, Mr. BRADY, for his extraordinary work on behalf of the committee, and we look forward to continuing to work with him.

Obviously, we have a bit of a disagreement, Mr. Speaker, on the committee budget cuts here; but I certainly would also applaud the work of all of our chairmen of our committees, as well as all of the ranking members, who very diligently went through their budgets trying to make the appropriate cuts and will continue to do that now, when this resolution is certainly passed, as we go forward, I think, for all of us, really, trying to create a fis-

cally responsible level of funding here and, again, something that allocates resources in the very best way that we can, that allows this House to complete its work on behalf of the American people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would say, I believe that we are leading by example with this resolution today, and we need to show that the important work of government can certainly be done, and we can do it well with less. Doing more with less, that's a very well-used term, but it is certainly appropriate for this, during times of tight budgets.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 115, a resolution to fund the House standing and select Committees for the 113th Congress. As a member of the House Administration Committee, I have first-hand knowledge of the work that went into this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

As you know, with the implementation of the sequester on March 1st, across-the-board spending cuts took effect. In the wake of this, the House Administration Committee had a chance to hear from our colleagues—the Chairman and Ranking Member of each House Committee—about how they would handle the impact of the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee acted in a deliberative and fair manner when determining Committee budgets for the 113th Congress. Each Committee serves an important function, and while all will have to continue to produce good work with less, I am confident that they will succeed.

In the 112th Congress, the House recognized that economic difficulties were forcing the nation to tighten its belt. Rather than continuing runaway spending, this body chose to demonstrate that we were serious about getting our fiscal house in order by enacting an 11.4 percent cut in Committee funding. Today's vote gives us an important chance to show that, while families across the country are struggling to make ends meet, the House plans to continue leading by example.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this resolution includes cuts that will force Committees to make tough decisions. However, when the government faces across the board cuts, this institution should not be exempt. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 115.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 136, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—272

|           |          |             |
|-----------|----------|-------------|
| Alexander | Bachus   | Barr        |
| Amash     | Barber   | Barrow (GA) |
| Bachmann  | Barletta | Barton      |



Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carney  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cicilline  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Enyart  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Foster  
Foxx  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Gallo  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harris  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly  
Kilmer  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee

Olson  
Owens  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Veasey  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IN)

## NAYS—136

Andrews  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bishop (NY)  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers

Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Farr  
Forbes  
Fudge  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Himes  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kind  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKeon  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Moore  
Moran  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Rogers (AL)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Tahano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Pascarella  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt  
Amodei  
Collins (GA)  
DeLauro  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Fattah  
Fortenberry  
Gohmert  
Graves (MO)  
Harper  
Hinojosa  
Langevin  
Lipinski  
Lynch  
Miller, George

## □ 1630

Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, PASTOR of Arizona, QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COLE and LOEBSACK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 82, on consideration of H. Res. 115, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, because I was questioning the Director the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my capacity as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a rollcall vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on No. 82.

# CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1614

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (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, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to bring forward and present the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014. We believe that we owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget, and that is precisely what we are bringing to the floor today. Our budget balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes. Balancing the budget will help us foster a healthier economy, and it will help us create jobs.

In fact, two leading economists at Stanford University today released a study analyzing our budget and its positive effects on the economy and jobs. In the first year, they said it would, “boost the economy immediately,” increasing growth of our economy by a whole percentage point, which translates into about 500,000 jobs right away. That’s about \$1,500 in extra