

reinstate proper funding of the much-needed protections authorized in the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform laws, and leaves in place broad cuts to environmental protection and food safety and inspection that keep us safe.

But, simply put, this measure will prevent a government shutdown and keep our Nation moving forward, and I believe it will allow us ample time to come together on a 2014 budget that I know the American people are owed and deserve. We cannot afford to keep bringing this great Nation to the brink of the fiscal cliff for nothing more than purely misguided political reasons. It does nothing but further jeopardize the certainty that the American people need, now more than ever, to ensure that their family or small business can find success and prosper.

While at its very core I find this measure incomplete, I will support it and hope that my colleagues agree to come together, craft a budget that properly funds our Nation that can be signed into law by the President, and work each and every day hereafter to put our country back on a path to fiscal responsibility and prosperity.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this continuing resolution.

The action we are taking today will restore some semblance of regular order. The CR, with the inclusion of 5 of the individual bills, is preferable to no appropriations process at all.

Perhaps this catch all bill for the remainder of 2013 will break the logjam and signal restoration of regular order for 2014 bills, a return is long overdue. This is the Congress' rightful Constitutional role and duty—open hearings, normal amendments, and full floor consideration of all 12 appropriations bills.

Two weeks ago as the House first considered the CR, I had hoped to see significant improvement through the process of its consideration. This hope was not fully realized. Though some areas were improved, significantly the inclusion of 3 additional bills, in other areas the CR does not adequately address national needs. The Energy and Water Development jurisdiction is just one example of where the CR falls short.

Congress' failure to do our jobs and pass discrete annual appropriation bills limits our ability to respond to changing realities within government programs as well as our ability to perform appropriate oversight.

The bill does not address the sequester. These unnecessary, indiscriminate reductions will cut economic growth by one-third. Though economists predict sequestration will cost 2 million jobs, not passing the measure would cost even more.

We cannot continue to make decisions whose adverse impact falls primarily on the middle class and those who are the most vulnerable in our country. Our Nation is at its best when we ensure that opportunity is available to everyone, opportunity which is the bedrock of the American dream.

The measure, though far from perfect . . . gives some confidence, albeit late, to the 2013 budget, the public, and the markets so that normal federal transactions can occur—with clarity.

While I believe improvements could and should be made, the alternatives carry a higher risk. I will therefore reluctantly support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 20, 2013, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 and the previous order of the House, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks 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 further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0955

##### 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 further 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, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, amendment no. 5 printed in House Report 113-21 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider 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 gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to start off by thanking all of our hardworking staff, and I would like to include for the RECORD a list of all the staff members on the Republican side of the aisle who put such work into this. I want to recognize in particular one member of our team, our health care policy expert, Charlotte Ivancic. She was there for our first budget, and this marks her last budget, as she is now joining Speaker BOEHNER's team. Charlotte devoted long hours to working with Medicare actuaries, and she was instrumental in the bipartisan collaboration with Senator WYDEN and former Clinton Budget Director Alice Rivlin. She always understood that our hard work is for a higher purpose. Her husband, Nick, and their two boys, Otto and Jack, are what motivate her work, and that passion has been contagious. It's been an honor to work at her side.

I want to thank all of the hardworking staffers—on both sides of the aisle—for helping to elevate this important budget debate.

We wish her very good luck.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

##### HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Alex Stoddard, Andy Morton, Austin Smythe, Brian Bolduc, Charlotte Ivancic, Conor Sweeney, David Logan, Dennis Teti, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, James McKittrick (intern), Jane Lee, Jenna Speelman, Jim Herz, Jon Burks, Jon Romito.

Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Marsha Douglas, Mary Popadiuk (intern), Matt Carter, Matt Hoffmann, Nicole Foltz, Paul Restuccia, Stephanie Parks, Ted McCann, Tim Flynn, Tim Azarchs (intern), Trent Johnson (intern), Vanessa Bazan (intern), Vanessa Day, William Allison.

##### CONGRESSMAN PAUL RYAN'S STAFF

Allison Steil, Andy Speth, Aubrey Yanzito, Ben Erickson, Casey Higgins, Chad Herbert, Danyell Tremmel, Donald Schneider, James Scimecca, Joyce Meyer, Kevin Seifert.

Lauren Schroeder, Matthew Varvaro, Megan Wagner, Rick Jacobson, Robert Swift, Sarah Peer, Smythe Anderson, Susie Liston, Teresa Mora, Tricia Stoneking.

##### HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE ASSOCIATE STAFF

Abby Gunderson, Rep. Rigell (VA); Alexis Alber, Rep. Hartzler (MO); Andrew Shaw, Rep. Garrett (NJ); Annie Boyajian, Rep. Walorski (IN); Brian Lenihan, Rep. Black (TN); Brittan Specht, Rep. McClintock (CA); Bryan Blom, Rep. Duffy (WI); Christy Paavola, Rep. Ribble (WI); Colby Hale, Rep. Williams (TX); Courtney Titus, Rep. Rice (SC); David Malech, Rep. Campbell (CA).

Deena Contreras, Rep. Calvert (CA); Jerry White, Rep. Messer (IN); Jon Oehmen, Rep. Flores (TX); Keith Studdard, Rep. Blackburn (TN); Kevin Kincheloe, Rep. Lankford (OK); Kyle Cormney, Rep. Price (GA); Megan Wenrich, Rep. Rokita (IN); Meyer Seligman, Rep. Nunnelee (MS); Nick Myers, Rep. Woodall (GA); Steve Waskiewicz, Rep. Cole (OK).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the last couple days, we've had a spirited debate on the budget. We have deep differences on this issue, but

I want to commend Chairman RYAN for the way he conducts the business of the Budget Committee. The debate is lively but always civil, and I thank him for the way he has run the committee.

I also want to thank all the other members of the Budget Committee for their full participation in this debate and to the staffs, both Republican staff and Democratic staff, who work so hard for their service to our country. I want to commend our team who has been working very hard and ask that their names be included in the RECORD along with the members of the Republican staff.

Mr. Chairman, these budget resolutions are mostly comprised of lots of numbers on lots of pages, but we know that behind these numbers are key decisions about the future direction of our country and our priorities and values as a nation.

I was disappointed that yesterday this House did not pass our Democratic budget alternative that presents a solutions-based approach to address our challenges instead of an ideological approach. Today, I'm going to ask the House to vote against the Republican budget because of its uncompromising ideological approach, and I will explain more about that in a moment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MINORITY STAFF

Abernathy, Sarah  
Ballis, Ellen  
Capstick, Kathleen  
Carasso, Adam  
Cummings, Ken  
Griffin, Jocelyn  
Frey, Bridgett  
Kahn, Tom  
Kamal, Najy  
McDowell, Shelia  
Meredith, Diana  
Miller, Erin  
Overbeek, Kimberly  
Robb, Karen  
Russell, Scott  
Stephenson, Beth  
Zegers, Ted

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire of the gentleman from Maryland as to how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am the only speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

□ 1000

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and congratulate Mr. RYAN and our members of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

We have a budget here that will, in fact, balance over the next 10 years after having a debate with our colleagues across the aisle and across the building and downtown who all have budgets that never come to balance.

I don't know where "a balanced plan" can be called "a balanced plan" if we never get to balance. The fact is that we've done the hard work of bringing this plan forward.

This budget does more than just balance. It helps improve the lives and concerns of the American people and addresses things that are important to American families such as fixing the Tax Code. Lowering rates means more jobs and higher wages for the American people.

Voting for this budget means supporting the Keystone pipeline, and American-made energy means more jobs and lower energy prices for the American people.

Repealing ObamaCare and supporting patient-centered reforms means more jobs and lower health care costs for the American people; and protecting and strengthening Medicare means a secure retirement for older Americans.

Cutting waste means more fairness and accountability for hardworking taxpayers.

Doing all of this means preserving the American Dream, which is what we were sent here to do.

We've balanced the budget before. In 1997, a Republican Congress working with a Democrat President, Bill Clinton, came together to put forward a plan that would, in fact, balance the budget. And we did. For 4 years we ran a budget surplus.

The President has an opportunity during this critical debate to come forward and to help make this part of his legacy like it has become part of the Clinton legacy, working together on behalf of the American people to solve what we know is a crisis in our country. We can't continue to spend money that we don't have. It's as simple as that.

When you've spent more money than what you've brought in for 50 of the last 60 years, no American family can do this, no business can do this, and no government can do this without bringing on a debt crisis that is sure to imperil the future of our kids and our grandkids.

Vote for the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'm going to reserve the balance of my time since I have the right to close and we have no more speakers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to urge our colleagues to vote against this Republican budget for a variety of reasons.

First of all, this is an uncompromising, ideological approach to our budget issues. We've just been through a major national campaign where both Presidential candidates, President Obama and Governor Romney, agreed on one thing, and that was that the people in this country faced a fundamental choice in the direction we were going to take. The American people voted, and they resoundingly rejected the approach that is now taken once again for the third year in a row in this Republican budget.

This budget, as we've heard over the last couple of days, fails on a number of counts. Number one, it adopts the

European-style austerity approach that we've seen slow down economies in many parts of Europe. We should instead be focusing on job growth and putting people back to work rather than a budget, like this budget, which will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working by the end of this year. That's according to the independent, non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. It will result in more than 2 million fewer people working next year.

It also fails the test of taking a balanced approach because it is founded on the failed idea that giving another round of tax cuts to people at the very high end of the income scale will somehow trickle down and lift up all the other boats. We know that hasn't worked, and yet it is pursued once again such that everybody in the Republican budget is asked to sacrifice except folks at the very top, everybody else, including middle class Americans who will see their tax burden go up in order to finance tax breaks for people at the very high end.

We Democrats offered an amendment in the Budget Committee to say don't increase taxes on middle class Americans, and all our Republican colleagues voted "no." It is based on the idea that we should dramatically cut investments that are important to help our economy grow.

We know we have an aging infrastructure problem. We know we need to modernize our national infrastructure to compete in the global economy; yet this cuts our infrastructure and transportation budget by over 20 percent when we just got a grade of D-plus from the American Society of Civil Engineers and when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

It makes it harder for students to go to college. The Republican budget will double the student loan interest rate in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

In the part of our budget where we make important investments in science and research and education, it more than doubles the sequester cut.

It violates important commitments we've made to our seniors. It reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole so that seniors with high health care costs will pay thousands of dollars more over the period of this budget. It turns Medicare into a voucher program so seniors are faced with the risk of rising health care costs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it's based on this false idea that you can claim to balance the budget in 10 years when you claim also to be getting rid of ObamaCare when all they do is get rid of the benefits of ObamaCare, but this budget only reaches its claim of balance because they keep the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to reject this approach and to adopt the balanced Democratic approach to dealing with these national challenges.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this budget is constructive. It reveals each side's priorities. It clarifies the divide that exists between us.

We want to balance the budget; they don't. We want to restrain spending; they want to spend more money. We think taxpayers have given enough to Washington; they want to raise taxes by at least a trillion dollars. Take more to spend more. We want to strengthen programs like Medicare; they seem to be complicit with its demise. We see ObamaCare as a roadblock to patient-centered health care reform; they see it as a sacred cow. We think our national security is a top priority; they want to hollow out our military. We offer modernization, reform, growth and opportunity; they're clinging to the status quo: more taxing, more spending, more borrowing.

This plan recognizes that if we cannot handle our out-of-control debt, we will lose control of our future. We cut wasteful spending, and we balance the budget.

This plan recognizes that concern for the poor is not measured by how much money we spend in Washington, but instead how many people we get out of poverty. We reform antipoverty programs so that they work. We help strengthen communities and families. We recognize the need for a vibrant economy.

The Stanford economist that looked at this budget last week said 500,000 jobs right away; \$1,500 more in take-home pay for families in the first year; 1.7 million jobs and \$4,000 in better take-home pay on average for a family in the 10th year.

This plan will protect and strengthen Medicare; and it begins, yes, by repealing ObamaCare because that does great damage to Medicare.

Again, the House is leading the way.

We have a jobs deficit. We have a budget deficit. These are the byproducts of a leadership deficit. We still have no budget from the President in violation of the law. He gets his NCAA bracket in on time, but still there's no budget. This is the fourth time in 5 years. He set a new record this year, 2 months with no plan while we have trillion-dollar deficits and a debt crisis on the horizon.

They have time for the attacks, but no time to offer serious solutions. His party leaders are unfortunately failing to offer a serious account of our challenge: no serious plan to grow the economy or create jobs, no plan to ever balance the budget. Take more, trillions of dollars more to spend more in Washington. That's what got us in this mess in the first place.

□ 1010

So what can be done?

The good news is that we now have a vehicle for regular order. The Democrats derailed the budget process each of the last few years and stopped governing when they stopped budgeting. At least we now have a budget process

that's moving. We've brought them back in the game this spring. That's a good thing.

So what's going to happen in the weeks ahead?

We will make the case for our priorities. Whether the gentleman from Maryland wants to acknowledge it or not, we have divided government. The American people elected a Republican majority in the House, and our job is to make the case for our policies, find common ground where it exists and see if we can make this divided government work, and that is what we intend to do. We owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget. That's what we are delivering today, and I urge the support of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the disastrous budget put forward by the House Majority. Once again, the Majority has put forward a plan that slashes deeply into our commonsense priorities and tries to balance the budget on the backs of seniors, women, and the most vulnerable.

A budget is about more than just numbers—it is a reflection and embodiment of our values and priorities as a society. Our budget should advance our moral responsibilities as a nation to provide for the common good. I just attended the installation of Pope Francis in Rome, where he stressed the importance of working “to protect all of God's people and embrace with tender affection the whole of humanity, especially the poorest, the weakest, the least important.”

But the budget before us, like the previous iterations composed by Chairman RYAN and supported by the House Majority, once again fails this critical moral test. In fact, it gets it exactly backwards. To pay for expanded tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, two-thirds of the nondefense cuts over ten years here come to programs that serve low- and moderate-income families.

If this budget were to become law, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that two million jobs will be lost next year alone. That is not all. Millions of students would lose the access to college education that comes through Pell Grants. 190,000 children would lose access to Head Start. National Service programs like Americorps would be ended.

Medicaid would be slashed by nearly a third, cutting families off from access to health care. Food Stamps by nearly 18 percent, with up to nine million people cut off from assistance they need so they do not go hungry. Both would be converted to an inadequate block grant. The health reforms we passed would all be rolled back meaning the donut hole will reopen, women would once again have to pay more for the same insurance as men, and children with preexisting conditions could lose their coverage.

Seniors would have to pay more during retirement for health care. The Child Tax Credit would expire in 2017. And middle-class families would pay \$2000 more a year in taxes, all to pay for a \$200,000 tax cut for millionaires.

The American people already roundly rejected this Reverse Robin Hood plan last November. Instead, they want us to use the budget as a vehicle to create jobs and grow the economy. I urge my colleagues to respect their wishes, and to vote against this latest iteration of the same old Republican budget.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I will vote today for H. Con. Res. 25, authored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, because we have a duty to address our nation's looming fiscal obligations. As I have repeatedly said, we cannot continue to kick the proverbial can down the road.

I want to be clear: I would prefer to vote for a bipartisan budget modeled off the Simpson-Bowles plan. It could be improved by incorporating changes in existing law and other proposals, such as the discussions between the president and Speaker BOEHNER, and plans offered by Alice Rivlin and Pete Domenici, and Rep. RYAN and Sen. WYDEN. Like the Ryan plan before us today, I do not agree with every line in the Simpson-Bowles plan. However, I continue to believe that a budget based on this model is the only plan that can put our nation on a sustainable, long-term path to replace sequestration and reform our nation's entitlement programs so they will exist for future generations.

For more than six years, I have forcefully spoken out about the dire need to get our nation's fiscal house in order. I have made thoughtful and serious recommendations for a way forward and have voted for substantial legislation to get our nation back on solid financial footing.

When I came to the floor to vote for last year's budget, we were \$15.5 trillion in debt. Today, we are over \$16.7 trillion in debt. It's projected to grow to \$26 trillion in 10 years—that's a \$10 trillion increase. Our unfunded obligations and liabilities are now projected to be over \$71 trillion. We've just had our fourth straight year of trillion dollar deficits. Four straight years.

And while this year's deficit is projected to be about \$845 billion, that's still unsustainable. The reduction in the deficit can be mainly traced to new tax revenues from the “fiscal cliff” deal versus new spending restraint. I opposed this measure because it failed to seriously address government spending—in fact, it contained new spending—and did not include reforms to strengthen and secure entitlements. While the measure addressed many immediate issues, its adoption is making it more difficult to make needed, comprehensive reforms to our long-term obligations and liabilities and to stop sequestration.

The amount of debt we owe is staggering. Consider that this past August, the Congressional Budget Office predicted we'd be spending \$570 billion on interest payments to service the debt in 2022. However, the February picture is shocking: \$795 billion to serve the debt in 2022. Let me repeat—in August, the Congressional Budget Office predicted that we would be spending \$570 billion to service the debt in 10 years. Their updated February numbers predict we will be sending \$795 billion out the door in 2022 to service the debt, a \$225 billion increase within six months. In six months, the projections have changed to reflect that the Congressional Budget Office thinks we will be spending close to \$11 billion in interest payments per week to more than \$15 billion per week. Fifteen billion dollars each week. And they predict that in 2023, 10 years from now, we will be sending \$857 billion out the door. That's roughly \$16.5 billion dollars per week.

What accounts for these changes? We have been borrowing at historically low levels. I have repeatedly noted my concerns that interest rates on our debt load could increase, and

the Congressional Budget Office predictions are starting to reflect this.

That is money that could be invested in our national defense, repairing our roads and bridges or life-saving cancer research.

Notably, this debt is increasingly held by foreign countries. In 1970, 6 percent of debt held by the public was in foreign hands. In 1990, it was 19 percent. But today, 48 percent of our publically held debt is in foreign hands.

Just who are our bankers? Nations such as China, which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith, and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia, which funded the radical madrasahs on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Quite frankly, this borrowing is unsustainable, dangerous and irresponsible.

And what does this mean for individual Americans? Chairman RYAN points out that a 1 percent increase in the interest rates would mean an extra \$400 per year in interest payments for the average family.

That is why I have been urging the president and Congress to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren.

That is why I have been working with my colleagues, through my assignment as chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that funds the departments of Commerce and Justice, to cut \$95 billion in federal spending during fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012, including more than \$11.5 billion from my subcommittee alone.

That is why I repeatedly voted against the payroll tax holiday, which stole directly from the Social Security Trust Fund. The 2012 extension took \$93 billion and brought us nearly a month closer to the statutory debt limit. With that one vote, we practically wiped out all the \$95 billion in savings from the cuts enacted during the last Congress.

That is why I also do not and never will sign pledges to lobbyists. My loyalty is to the Constitution, to the people of Virginia's 10th District, and my family.

I have been speaking out about the need to get our nation's fiscal house in order since President George W. Bush was in office.

In 2006, I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address our debt and deficit. I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. It said everything should be on the table for discussion: all entitlement spending, all domestic discretionary spending, including defense spending, and tax reform, particularly changes to make the tax code more simple and fair and to end the practice of tax earmarks that costs hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations, just as was done in the base closing process.

I was glad to have been joined in this effort by my good friend and colleague JIM COOPER of Tennessee. Our legislation served as the blueprint for the president's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Last year, I spoke in support of and voted for a full substitute amendment, offered by Mr. COOPER and former Representative LaTou-

rette, to the budget that was based on the commission's recommendations. While I was disappointed that this amendment did not pass, I still believe a plan based on this model is the most appropriate and realistic path forward, and I am committed to finding bipartisan solutions.

Last month, I offered a bipartisan amendment to H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, that would require the president to incorporate the Simpson-Bowles recommendations into his budget submission to Congress. This amendment received 75 bipartisan votes.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called "The Moment of Truth," the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed, as well other "sacred cows," including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the president, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The president failed the country. And the Congress has also failed. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the president must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests that are holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the president also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions of dollars in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

Absent a bipartisan budget, I vote for the Ryan budget today because it is a credible path forward, if imperfect.

Like last year's proposal, this budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates and for the repeal of the costly health care reform law.

Further, it proposes a balanced budget in the next 10 years. I have consistently voted for a balanced budget amendment to the constitution every time the measure has come before the House—in 1982, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1995 and, more recently, in 2011.

The Ryan plan also points out that we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is again silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN continues to pull back the curtain on the mandatory spending "elephant in the room," which we can no longer ignore.

I do not agree with everything in this proposal, and will work to improve future legisla-

tion that may be considered as a result of its adoption. For example, I regret that this proposal does not offer more on ways to address Social Security and tax reform.

I am also troubled that this resolution unfairly targets the federal workforce. While there are many federal employees in the capital region, it is worth noting that more than 85 percent of the workforce is outside of Washington.

It is also worth noting that more than 65 percent of all federal employees work in agencies that support our national defense capabilities as we continue to fight the War on Terror. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. CIA, FBI, DEA agents, and State Department employees are serving side-by-side with our military in the fight against the Taliban.

Let's also not forget the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents who are working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants and drugs across our borders.

Or the medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

Or the VA doctors and nurses treating veterans from World War II to present day.

Or the FDA inspectors working to stop a salmonella outbreak. These are all federal employees.

Mr. Chair, enough is enough. It is simply wrong to claim, as the Ryan budget erroneously continues to do, that these public servants "have been immune from the effects of the recession."

This budget also could be improved by providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do so in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, "He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord." And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. Matthew 25 says that if we ignore the poor and hungry, it is the same as ignoring him. But this budget resolution is an outline for future action, not an enacting piece of legislation that carries the weight of law.

The budget also seeks to shore up our defense capabilities by finding alternative savings to prevent the across-the-board cuts (sequestration) resulting from the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction's bipartisan failure of leadership, which, regrettably, represents the larger failure of the President and both political parties.

For the first time in four years, the Senate has proposed a budget resolution. While I do not agree with their proposal, and therefore voted "no" on the Mulvaney amendment to demonstrate my opposition to it, it is good for our country that the Senate has finally put forth a written document. Its voice in this debate is needed. I am disappointed that the president has failed to even offer his own budget. This abdication of responsibility has not been seen since the Harding Administration.

This budget recognizes that our fiscal challenges must be dealt with in a timely manner. It is a first step in the process. This is a blueprint that can be molded and changed, but it is a blueprint that committees will use to get to work. I hope this outline will spur the authorizing committees to move forward on comprehensive tax and entitlement reform legislation.

The Appropriations Committee has already led the way in enacting legislation cutting discretionary spending. Only 16 percent of federal spending this year will be non-defense discretionary. Two thirds of our spending is on autopilot, and reforms are urgently needed. We must reform our nation's spending habits to ensure America has the ability to nimbly respond to crises and is able to make the investments needed to spur private growth and American ingenuity.

We, as elected representatives, have a duty to lead. We have a duty to put forth ideas within the public sphere and engage in debate. I'm ready to make the tough choices today. I vote for the Ryan budget so that the House can get to work.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the House Republican budget.

The Path to Prosperity will balance the budget over the next ten years without raising taxes on the American people.

Furthermore, the House Republican budget will help American job seekers by repealing Obamacare. The Obama health care law contains over a trillion dollars in new taxes on employers, medical device makers, families buying health insurance and others.

Throughout my district, small business owners and CEOs are sitting down with their accountants. They are trying to figure out how they are going to do business next year with this massive tax in place. That is creating uncertainty and impeding job creation.

Repealing Obamacare is critical to getting our economy growing again.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 25, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2014." I oppose this irresponsible budget resolution because it continues the reckless approach to fiscal policy that that the House majority championed for years, with disastrous results.

I oppose the resolution before us because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class. I oppose the resolution because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract in our America by turning Medicaid into a block grant.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the backs of seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, we Democrats have a better way. We understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures. Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out

of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, beginning in 2024 all Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to “wither on the vine.”

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year. The Republican plan would reopen the “donut hole,” forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than \$2,970 for the year. Seniors reaching the prescription drug “donut hole” would pay an average of \$828 more in prescription drug costs in 2014 and approximately \$13,000 more from now through 2022.

5. Under the Republican budget, 2,445,462 Texas seniors would be forced to pay for preventive health services. By repealing health reform, the Republican plan will require that the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2012 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

6. The Republican budget slashes \$31.71 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

7. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve 91,717 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, this budget could have invested in programs that help strengthen the middle class, reduce poverty, and strengthen our economic recovery. Instead, the Republican budget makes deep cuts to the area of the budget helping low-income families put food on the table and make ends meet. These are families who are already struggling with unemployment, lower wages, and just simply trying to make ends meet.

The House Republican budget will push millions more Americans into poverty and put a large number of low-income children, seniors, and people with disabilities at risk. It guts Medicare and Medicaid and calls for massive cuts to food assistance, all in order to protect tax breaks for special interests and for multimillionaires who are not even asking for them.

The Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, shortsighted, reckless—but “fair and balanced” is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, Congress-

sional Black Caucus, and Congressional Progressive Caucus, which were made in order by the Rules Committee, are each worthy of support because they fairly balance the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

Specifically, the Alternative Budgets proposed by the Democratic Caucus, CBC, and CPC:

- help create more jobs now;
- replace the sequester;
- make key education investments;
- invest in research and development and clean energy;
- invest in long-term infrastructure;
- preserve Medicare as we know it;
- protect health reform's benefits for seniors;
- protect Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes;
- preserve Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP);
- reduce the deficit through a smart, targeted, and steady approach provides tax relief for working families and ends tax breaks for the wealthy;

- take a balanced approach to reducing the long-term deficits and debt; and
- put the budget on a sustainable path.

Mr. Chair, under the Democratic budget, the deficit would fall from 7 percent of GDP in 2012 to under 3 percent of GDP by 2015, and to 2.4 percent of GDP in 2023. The balanced plan put forward by the Democratic Caucus will bring the budget into primary balance in 2017 and complete balance by around 2040—about the same time as the House Republican budget last year.

The Democratic Budget Alternative will generate 1.2 million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans' “austerity first” plan by investing \$200 billion in creating jobs up-front, strengthening the middle class, creating greater upward mobility, and ensuring opportunity for our children and future generations.

Included in the Democratic proposal is \$50 billion to fund jobs that address immediate surface transportation priorities and \$10 billion to establish an infrastructure bank, as well as tax incentives to support small businesses and manufacturing.

Additionally, the Democratic budget immediately ends the sequester, which would otherwise cost the economy 750,000 jobs by the end of the year, and replaces it with deficit reduction resulting from a balanced approach combining responsible spending cuts with increased revenues by cutting tax breaks for special interests and wealthy individuals without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

Finally, Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, let me note my disappointment that an amendment I offered which would have made this dreadful budget resolution a little less hurtful was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

The Jackson Lee Amendment to H. Con. Res. 25 would put the Congress on record in support of current funding levels for crime prevention grant programs administered by the Department of Justice. The first and most important obligation of government is to ensure the safety of the people and nothing is more destabilizing to communities and inimical to job creation and economic growth than crime. That is why it is counterproductive to cut investments in crime prevention under the guise

of balancing a budget to spur economic growth.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values. As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

“The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.”

For that reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility. To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a “moral test.”

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards. The Democratic alternatives do not. For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 25 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this ill-conceived and unwise measure.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 25 and in support of the Van Hollen substitute.

The majority has offered a budget that literally doubles down on the sequester. This would be a disaster for El Paso. It would mean twice as many Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) furloughs as they are already facing and longer lines at our bridges into the foreseeable future. Nearly 100,000 jobs in the El Paso region depend on the \$80 billion in yearly cross border trade with Mexico. Longer lines at our ports of entry equals less trade and fewer jobs for El Pasoans. The majority budget includes a nearly \$100 billion cut to Pell Grants for low-income students. At the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), 65% of students use Pell Grants to afford their education. It would mean deep and irresponsible cuts to programs my constituents rely on, including Medicare. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has said the majority budget will result in 750,000 job losses this year. I cannot vote to put the future of so many El Pasoans at risk.

We need a credible, long-term plan that does not compromise the economic recovery now taking place. Although far from perfect, the substitute budget offered by Mr. Van Hollen comes closest to this goal. It fully replaces the sequester with a balanced mix of cuts and revenues and stabilizes our finances by reducing the deficit by \$1.8 trillion over the next ten years. If passed, this budget would prevent the 750,000 job losses associated with the sequester. Ending the sequester will also prevent furloughs for 20,000 El Pasoans, including our Border Patrol agents and civilian employees at Fort Bliss. The Van Hollen substitute also ensures we maintain a strong national defense while acknowledging that our military will be downsizing as the result of two wars ending. I support it as the most reasonable budget offered; however, the Van Hollen substitute fails to offer a solution to strengthen Medicare and Social Security for the long-term.

We need a real budget that can get buy-in from both political parties. Instead of playing to the fears of the political extremes, why not work to find the middle and compromise? I

came here to represent the interests of El Pasoans and govern responsibly. I hope that we can put the political posturing of this budget debate behind us and start finding real solutions.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, as the Ranking Member of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, I am voting “no” on the Continuing Resolution sent back to us by the Senate. This bill underfunds several important programs and initiatives, and does not provide adequate funding to continue the implementation of the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank. Moreover, this bill compounds that harm by allowing the sequester to continue.

I am particularly disturbed by serious problems in the Financial Services and General Government section of the bill.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is flat funded at fiscal year 2012 levels, before taking into account the effects of sequestration. This funding level will greatly harm the continued implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). This is a critical year for the ACA as the state exchanges prepare to go live, and as part of that effort, the IRS had asked for an additional \$254 million in funding to help administer several upcoming ACA tax credits and tax changes. Failing to provide this funding will hamper IRS efforts to continue the implementation of these important efforts—which will help individuals and small businesses—and will create more confusion by not providing the IRS with the resources to answer taxpayers' questions.

In addition, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is flat-funded at fiscal year 2012 levels despite a requested \$94 million increase. This funding level, further reduced by sequestration, will hinder the SEC in the continued implementation of Dodd-Frank, and will harm its enforcement duties. The SEC still needs to implement several of the most important Dodd-Frank rules and reforms, and this funding level will only slow that effort. This bill prevents the SEC from being the strong “cop on the beat” that we need to ensure that the abuses that helped cause the fiscal meltdown don't recur.

Moreover, our Federal Public Defenders, who are part of the Federal Judiciary budget, actually receive a small increase of \$9 million above the fiscal year 2012 level. However, this amount is less than they requested, and not enough to offset the overwhelming impact of sequestration. Our Federal Public Defenders provide indigent criminal defendants with their constitutionally protected right to counsel, and the effect of the CR and sequestration will substantially damage their ability to do their utmost to help their clients.

Lastly, federal employees are once again asked to endure a pay freeze. Our federal employees have already contributed an incredible amount of money to deficit reduction, and another federal pay freeze will only prevent the recruitment and retention of a qualified and committed workforce.

In reality, while this bill purports to maintain finding levels at the FY 2012 level, sequestration means further damaging cuts to these and other accounts. We need a solution that will prevent important services that all Americans depend on from being impacted, and allows all agencies the flexibility to address the current effect of the sequester. This bill fails in that regard.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the most important action we can take to provide for the long term health and prosperity of our nation is getting people back to work, and ensuring that those who are employed, stay employed. This can only be done by enacting a budget that achieves fiscal balance without imperiling economic progress. Unfortunately, the Republican budget fails this most basic principle. It will cost nearly 2 million jobs next year alone, and that's on top of the 750,000 jobs that will be lost due to sequestration this year. In Rhode Island, we have finally started to recover from the Great Recession that began in 2008, and our unemployment rate has dropped below 10 percent for the first time since 2009. For five years, Rhode Islanders have held on by their teeth, and the Republican budget would undermine the important gains we have made.

The prosperity of our nation is predicated on a healthy middle class—both parties can at least agree on that. Yet the Republican budget would put our middle class families, the drivers of our economy, further in debt by shifting the burden of paying for tax breaks for the wealthy onto working Americans and their kids.

We have seen this budget before. It's the same plan Governor Romney ran and lost on in November; it's the same budget Chairman RYAN brought before us in 2012. It is a budget that works for the most privileged, at the expense of every day Americans. It raises taxes on working families by as much as \$3,000, shifts costs to future seniors by turning Medicare into a “premium support” program, cuts state Medicaid funding for low income and disabled individuals, and doubles the cuts to programs that help our veterans find work, keep my constituent's homes heated, and save children from going hungry.

There's been no shortage of posturing on the budget, and a surplus of half-truths floating around. What's been in short supply, it seems to me, are the facts.

It is a fact that federal spending over the past three years has grown at its slowest pace since the Eisenhower administration. It is a fact that we have already cut \$2.4 trillion from the budget over the next ten years—and the Democratic alternative budget would increase that reduction to over \$4 trillion. It is a fact that we have cut nearly three dollars in spending for every dollar of revenue, greater than the ratio of cuts-to-revenue proposed in Simpson-Bowles. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, it is a fact that half of the projected budget deficit for 2013 is a result of automatic stabilizers, like unemployment insurance.

There's another important fact here that my Republican colleagues appear to be ignoring. They seem to think that if you reduce budgets for our schools, housing agencies, workforce training programs, veterans services, the Social Security Administration, and the FBI, the services these agencies provide to our communities won't diminish. Their workload certainly won't—in many cases it's on the rise—yet they will have fewer staff and fewer resources to serve our constituents and communities.

This is not a budget I can support in good conscience, and it is not a path that will lead to economic stability. Democrats have offered a fair and balanced approach that keeps the promises made to our seniors, preserves our

social safety net, and asks all Americans to pay their fair share in reducing the deficit. Rhode Islanders understand these choices, Americans understand these choices, and they responded loud and clear last November as to which direction they wanted our nation follow. The Republican budget is not what the American people voted for, this is not what Rhode Islanders want, and it is not what our children, our business owners, and our communities deserve.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget developed by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN. This budget would not only jeopardize seniors, families, and the most vulnerable in our society, it would also destroy jobs and put our Nation's economic recovery at risk. In fact, some estimate that 2 million American jobs could be lost in 2014 under the Ryan budget.

The Ryan budget would protect the wealthy while severely harming seniors and the American middle class. Millionaires would receive an average net tax cut of \$200,000, while middle class families could see their taxes rise by an average of \$2,000. This approach is neither equitable nor balanced.

The Ryan budget would cut the crucial programs our families rely on by slashing non-defense discretionary spending by more than \$1 trillion below the level of the 2011 Budget Control Act caps. This budget denies Americans access to life-saving health care by ending the Medicare guarantee, drastically cutting the Medicaid program, and repealing the Affordable Care Act. These cuts would immediately raise health insurance and prescription drug costs for women, while reducing access to care and support for nursing home residents. The Ryan budget could also result in an 18% cut in help with child care expenses to families working hard to make ends meet, and could cause about 200,000 children to lose access to Head Start in 2014 alone.

We all know that tough decisions must be made regarding the deficit, but our budget must not be balanced on the backs of women, children, seniors, and middle class families. Instead, we must invest in our children, in our students, and in our families to move our Nation forward. We must ensure that all Americans have access to health care. And we must invest in our infrastructure to create jobs and pave the way for a stronger economic future. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ryan budget and work together to create jobs and protect middle class families.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 25, the fiscal year (FY) 2014 budget resolution. Once again, this body is considering another misguided budget that asks seniors and middle class Americans to make great sacrifices so the wealthiest among us can get a tax cut. While supporters of this budget claim they deserve credit for producing a budget that balances, this is not a balanced plan, nor a serious one.

The Republican budget is a slippery, dishonest collection of old, failed ideas that the American people roundly rejected in the last election. Some say that this budget plan represents a serious attempt to reform Medicare; in fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. It ends Medicare as we know it by creating a voucher program which would shift costs to our seniors. It also repeals the Affordable Care Act which is already providing critical

benefits to those in need across our country and that has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional. By reopening the Medicare prescription drug coverage gap, beneficiaries would see their costs increase by over \$13,000 from now through 2022. This is not the treatment our seniors deserve, and I know we can do better for them.

Instead of making critical investments in our economy to promote growth and create jobs, vital domestic programs would face drastic cuts. The entire mandatory Pell grant program would be cut by \$98 billion over 10 years, virtually eliminating the program. Student loan rates would rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent in July, which would have a negative impact on college students across the nation. The budget also doubles down on the disastrous sequester and goes even further than that by cutting an extra \$55 billion from domestic discretionary spending in FY 2014 alone. To top it off, the top tax rate would be lowered to 25 percent, costing our nation nearly \$6 trillion over 10 years. In order to pay for these disastrous proposals, critical tax deductions for middle class families would be eliminated, leaving the average family with an increase of \$3,000 in their tax bill. The priorities of this budget are completely backwards.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for offering a balanced approach in the Democratic substitute budget. This budget replaces the sequester, makes investments which are critical for economic growth, and puts our nation on a sustainable fiscal path. It gives critical support to transportation, education, and small businesses programs which will have a real impact on middle class families and help maintain the upward trajectory of our economy. The Democratic budget also includes \$50 billion for immediate surface transportation projects which will create jobs today, in addition to vital tax incentives for the manufacturing sector which has been so critical to our economic recovery. All of these important goals are achieved while continuing the Medicare guarantee for our seniors and generating enough deficit reduction to eliminate the sequester, thereby avoiding losing 750,000 jobs which would occur if sequestration is allowed to continue.

If my Republican colleagues are serious about producing a balanced budget then let us set aside this partisan rhetoric and recycled ideas and come to the table willing and ready to make tough decisions for the benefit of our country. American families across the country make tough decisions about their family's budget on a daily budget. Whether it is postponing that new car purchase, refinancing their homes, or cutting back on the types of groceries they buy, American families do not have the luxury to return to past bad ideas. They have to make the tough decisions now or face losing their home, missing a tuition payment, or having their heat turned off. Instead of debating political documents such as this one, Congress must put aside the political games and come together to find common ground to put our nation on a sustainable fiscal path in the long term while making much needed investments in the short term. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Republican budget.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, for far too long, Washington has failed to take its spending problem and its budgetary responsibilities seriously. That ends now. With our nation's debt

exceeding \$16.7 trillion and billions more added to the debt every day, I am proud to finally help put our nation on a significantly different, more-prosperous path with my support of this year's House Budget from Chairman PAUL RYAN.

This is a responsible budget that will promote a healthier economy, encourage growth and opportunity for all Americans, help create jobs, and avert a debt crisis. This budget will enable us to avoid austerity measures and painful cuts that are inevitable if we fail to reform the status quo.

This budget balances our nation's finances in ten years, because it's wrong to keep spending money we do not have. This budget cuts wasteful spending and repeals Obamacare. This budget forces the government to live within its means, because it's unfair to leave young people and the next generation with a future of debt and decline. This budget moves us closer to pro-growth tax reform without raising taxes—because families and small businesses should be able to keep more of their hard-earned income instead of having it wasted by Washington bureaucrats.

Importantly, this budget protects and strengthens Medicare for current and future generations of retirees. Last year, I made a promise that I would not support changes to Medicare for people age 55 and older—those born before 1959. Today, I made good on that promise with my support of PAUL RYAN's budget. However, let me be clear: Congress, the President, and the American people cannot again afford to ignore fixing our broken entitlement system this year. The problem with Medicare's looming insolvency gets dramatically worse and more costly each year we delay fixing it, and the current solutions will no longer be sustainable or available if we fail to act this year. If we want to avoid forcing Medicare changes and dramatic cuts for individuals nearing retirement, we need both sides of the aisle to get serious immediately.

This House plan presents a clear vision of what we need to do to balance the budget and foster a healthier economy for today and the future. In fact, according to an analysis conducted by two Stanford economists, the House Budget "would boost the economy immediately," and "raise gross domestic product by one percentage point in 2014, equivalent to about a \$1,500 increase in annual income for each U.S. household." Additionally, these economists estimate that ten years from now, "the entire plan would raise GDP by three percentage points, or more than \$4,000 for each U.S. household."

By contrast, the budgets proposed by Democrat leaders in Congress are full of budget tricks, accounting gimmicks and empty promises. Their budgets ignore the entitlement crisis—the most significant driver of our debt—increase taxes and stimulus spending by trillions of dollars, and never balance—ever.

I ran for Congress because we have a solemn responsibility to pass on a better future to our children, just like our parents did for us. Today, I am pleased that we took a vital step to turn things around and finally put us on a more responsible, prosperous path for the future. But our work and responsibilities continue. The United States can and will remain the greatest country on Earth for generations to come, but it will require a fresh approach to Washington's old ways of doing business.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 122, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the previous order of the House, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 25 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 933, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 207, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)
Alexander	Duncan (TN)	Kingston
Bachmann	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus	Farenthold	Kline
Barletta	Fincher	Labrador
Barr	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Barton	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Benishek	Fleming	Lance
Bentivolio	Flores	Lankford
Billakis	Fortenberry	Latham
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latta
Black	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Long
Boehner	Gardner	Lucas
Bonner	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Gerlach	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Marchant
Bridenstine	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	McCaul
Buchanan	Gowdy	McClintock
Bucshon	Granger	McHenry
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Camp	Griffin (AR)	Rodgers
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Meadows
Cantor	Grimm	Meehan
Capito	Guthrie	Messer
Carter	Hall	Mica
Cassidy	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Harper	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hartzler	Mullin
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Cole	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Holding	Noem
Conaway	Hudson	Nugent
Cook	Huelskamp	Nunes
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Cramer	Hultgren	Olson
Crenshaw	Hunter	Palazzo
Culberson	Hurt	Paulsen
Daines	Issa	Pearce
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins	Perry
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
DeSantis	Jordan	Pitts
DesJarlais	Joyce	Poe (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Pompeo
Duffy	King (IA)	Posey

Price (GA)	Salmon	Turner
Radel	Scalise	Upton
Reed	Schock	Valadao
Reichert	Schweikert	Wagner
Renacci	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Ribble	Sensenbrenner	Walden
Rice (SC)	Sessions	Walorski
Rigell	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Roby	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wenstrup
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Williams
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Rokita	Stewart	Wittman
Rooney	Stivers	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Womack
Roskam	Stutzman	Woodall
Ross	Terry	Yoder
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Royce	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Runyan	Tiberi	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Tipton	Young (IN)

NAYS—207

Amash	Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano
Andrews	Grayson	Neal
Barber	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Green, Gene	Nolan
Bass	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gutierrez	Owens
Becerra	Hahn	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Heck (NV)	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Broun (GA)	Holt	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Polis
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capps	Israel	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Jeffries
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cartwright	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kennedy	Rush
Cicilline	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kuster	Schakowsky
Cohen	Langevin	Schiff
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Costa	Levin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lewis	Scott, David
Crawford	Lipinski	Serrano
Crowley	Loebsack	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sires
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Slaughter
DeGette	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Maffei	Speier
DeLauro	Maloney, Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Deutch	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Massie	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Matheson	Tierney
Doyle	Matsui	Titus
Duckworth	McIntyre	Tonko
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Enyart	McDermott	Vargas
Eshoo	McGovern	Veasey
Esty	McIntyre	Vela
Farr	McKinley	Velázquez
Fattah	McNerney	Viscosky
Forbes	Meeke	Walz
Foster	Meng	Walters
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Watt
Fudge	Moore	Waxman
Gabbard	Moran	Welch
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garcia		
Gibson		

Turner	Amodei	NOT VOTING—4
Upton	Engel	Miller, George
Valadao		Wasserman
Wagner		Schultz
Walberg		
Walden		
Walorski		
Weber (TX)		
Webster (FL)		
Wenstrup		
Westmoreland		
Whitfield		
Williams		
Wilson (SC)		
Wittman		
Wolf		
Womack		
Woodall		
Yoder		
Yoho		
Young (AK)		
Young (FL)		
Young (IN)		

NOT VOTING—4

Amodei Miller, George Wasserman Schultz

□ 1044

Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. STIVERS and STOCKMAN and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to concur.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 109, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—318

Aderholt	Carter	Esty
Alexander	Cassidy	Farenthold
Andrews	Castro (TX)	Fattah
Bachus	Chabot	Fincher
Barber	Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick
Barletta	Clay	Fleischmann
Barr	Cleaver	Flores
Barrow (GA)	Clyburn	Forbes
Barton	Coble	Fortenberry
Beatty	Coffman	Foster
Benishek	Cole	Foxx
Bentivolio	Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)
Bera (CA)	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Billakis	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (GA)	Cook	Gabbard
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Gallego
Black	Costa	Garcia
Blackburn	Cotton	Gardner
Blumenauer	Courtney	Garrett
Bonamici	Cramer	Gerlach
Bonner	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Boustany	Cuellar	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Cummings	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Brown (FL)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Delaney	Green, Al
Bucshon	DelBene	Green, Gene
Burgess	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Bustos	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Calvert	Dingell	Guthrie
Camp	Duckworth	Gutierrez
Campbell	Duffy	Hanna
Cantor	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Capito	Edwards	Harris
Capps	Ellmers	Hartzler
Carney	Enyart	Heck (NV)
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Heck (WA)