

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 671, Ruth Moore Act of 2013. This bill will right a wrong in our veterans' compensation process for those servicemembers suffering from military sexual trauma.

One of the problems we have when trying to help veterans victimized by their superiors is lack of information about how often it happens and how many veterans are victims.

This bill requires the VA to collect and report on many aspects of those who are suffering from MST, but are unable to get relief from the VA.

The VA will be required to provide on a monthly basis its progress with regards to military sexual trauma of every veteran that has applied for benefits or has been treated at a VA facility. This update shall include: The three most common reasons for denial, the average time for completion of these claims, the average time for processing MST claims and how MST compares to other PTSD claims.

We cannot know how to begin to treat and compensate victims of Military Sexual Trauma until we know more about this disability.

I fully support this legislation and urge its passage by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 671, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress an annual report on claims for disabilities incurred or aggravated by military sexual trauma, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2216, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2217, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 243

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2216) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate

shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 563. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 25, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution, and the allocations of spending authority printed in Tables 11 and 12 of House Report 113-17 shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1300

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. 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 gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the two underlying bills.

House Resolution 243 provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2216, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2014, and H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2014.

This rule provides ample opportunities for Members from both the minority and majority to participate in the debate, and it does not limit the number of amendments that may be considered, so long as the amendments comply with the rules of the House.

My colleagues from both sides of the aisle agree that these appropriation acts for fiscal year 2014 are the products of an open, collaborative, and bipartisan process.

They provide critical funding for military construction, housing, schools, and medical facilities for our servicemembers and their families, important veteran programs, the protection and security of our airports, seaports and national border, and disaster relief efforts. They also reduce duplication, improve oversight, encourage efficiency, and increase coordination of services.

Mr. Speaker, these bills address non-partisan issues that affect every one of us. The seamless operation of these agencies and programs and projects will benefit all Americans.

Let me first address H.R. 2216, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2014.

This fiscally sound bill funds programs that are necessary to keep our promises to our veterans and to train, equip, house, and support the brave men and women in uniform, as well as their families.

This bill provides over \$73 billion in discretionary funding, which is \$1.4 billion above the enacted fiscal year 2013 level. It continues to provide advanced funding that was approved in fiscal year 2013 for veteran medical care and funds programs to reduce the staggering backlog which severely delayed the process of veteran benefits claims. This advance funding will ensure that our veterans have full access to medical care regardless of where we stand in the annual appropriation process.

H.R. 2216 funds military construction projects, including family housing, military medical facilities, and Department of Defense education facilities. It also funds critical VA medical services and provides for a unified electronic health record system to integrate Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs health records.

Currently, our veterans must physically present a hard copy of their DOD health records at their VA appointments, and physicians are unable to look up the patient's medical history if a patient does not have their records with them. This bill addresses this frustrating and inefficient process and will begin to replace an archaic paper record system with an electronic system that will ensure our veterans will be efficiently served and receive the care they need and deserve.

Next, I'd like to talk about and highlight a few of the important provisions in H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2014. This bill is essential to protect the security of our national borders and the safety and well-being of all Americans.

This bill provides \$38 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Homeland Security, which includes funding for 21,370 Border Patrol agents and nearly 22,800 Customs and Border Protection officers—the largest totals in history. It also directs U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to train agents to identify and assist victims of human trafficking and directs ICE to increase spending on human trafficking and smuggling investigations.

H.R. 2217 also provides funding for FEMA to ensure our Nation is prepared to provide disaster relief and funds the Coast Guard.

Finally, I'd like to reiterate that these bills strengthen our national security and continue the well-being of our brave servicemembers, their families, and other veterans. They also recognize that our growing debt threatens the stability and safety of our Nation, and for this reason these bills make recommendations to reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies, duplication, and overhead.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Appropriations Committee has worked hard to provide us with two fiscally responsible appropriation bills that will meet the housing construction and medical needs of our military and provide support to their families. They will keep our promises to America's veterans, and they will enhance our national security.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd also like to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the former Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives, who clearly championed there and here, likewise, regular order.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2216 and H.R. 2217, as outlined by my colleague from the other side, two appropriations measures that fund military construc-

tion and family housing projects, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Homeland Security.

Once again, my friends on the other side are using this particular rule as yet another attempt to deem and pass the controversial budget offered by our colleague PAUL RYAN.

This is exactly what they did in April of last year when they reneged on their promises in the Budget Control Act and also during consideration of H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations for fiscal year 2013.

My Republican colleagues have been calling for regular order; however, both the House and the Senate each passed a budget this year and regular order would have them go to conference to negotiate a budget for the 113th Congress. But instead of appointing conferees, the Speaker of the House and the House Republican leadership are deeming the Ryan budget passed.

□ 1310

Someone in a graphic that I saw said they're deeming the impossible deem.

I, as one exemplar, should know, having served on the Rules Committee in the majority when we were going forward. We did consider deem and pass, and we learned along the way that that was going to skew the process. Therefore, we retreated from that, and I would urge my friends, the Republicans, to do likewise.

They would rather see, it appears, greater military spending, at the expense of vital programs that millions of Americans rely on, than work with Democrats to replace the sequester and properly fund our Nation's government.

Now, I'm not going through the litany of all the things that the sequester has cut and the problems that it has caused. Most people know that. But the Meals on Wheels program has been the one put forward, and I just think it is plain dumb and crazy to not take care of older people in our society. Never mind all the ideology, all the deficit, all the other hawk talk, who cares when someone that is a grandmother goes to sleep hungry because we didn't do what we should have done and that we passed a foolish sequester that has caused these problems.

As a result, we're working with different budget target levels. In the House, it is \$0.966 trillion and approximately \$1.07 trillion for the Senate, which both sides agreed upon in the Budget Control Act of 2011.

These differences are important. The reductions imposed by the House 302(b) allocations mean greater cuts for agencies and programs that already face difficult budget decisions due to sequestration. The two funding bills coming before us for consideration this week, along with those for defense and the legislative branch, are the only ones expected to receive an increase over the 2013 post-sequester levels. This means that we'll be forced to sacrifice health care, environment, education,

transportation, and other important spending priorities in order to meet the new overall reductions required by the sequester.

Furthermore, the appropriation for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs is the only budget with a 302(b) allocation that is higher than pre-sequestration funding levels, whereas funding for Homeland Security, in my opinion, is unacceptably low in some areas, and the bill is encumbered by very, very troublesome riders, and I would urge the Members of the House to look carefully at those riders.

Consequently, the 302(b) allocation would provide a 22 percent reduction to the pre-sequestration budget for health care, education, and labor programs. In my opinion, that's just plain outrageous.

Republicans are again asking—I'm fond of saying in the Rules Committee that when I was 11 and 12 years old, my favorite radio program that my grandmother would let me listen to on Saturdays was a program called "Let's Pretend." Little did I know 65 years later that I would be in an august body that is also in and of itself sitting around with people pretending that things are happening that are not happening.

Republicans are asking us to pretend that the Ryan budget is law, when in fact it is not. This unilateral action is a formula for conflict, and I predict for you that that's what we'll have. While I appreciate the spirit of bipartisanship, and those gentlemen who came yesterday, Mr. PRICE and Mr. BISHOP, the ranking members, and Judge CARTER and his counterpart did an exceptional job, as did JOHN CULBERSON, in showing this body that there can be bipartisan efforts. They did so, and I would hope that would serve for the rest of appropriations and for this body to take notice that people can work together when they try. And that bipartisanship led to the funding levels contained in both of these bills that we are considering under this rule. It is regrettable that it was not extended to the entire process.

Simply put, the framework within which we are considering these bills—the Ryan budget that House Republicans have deemed as passed—is a non-starter.

Administration folks said yesterday that unless this bill passes the Congress in the context of an overall budget framework that supports our recovery and enables sufficient investments in education, infrastructure—and a footnote right there: Do we need to be reminded about the bridge that fell in the State of Washington, about the number of bridges in this Nation that are in disrepair and have been in disrepair? When Bill Clinton became President, he advocated that there were 14,000 bridges in need of repair, and he asked for a little bit of money that we should have allocated then. Now we have thousands of bridges in disrepair, and we are going about a process like this ignoring them.

Where do we get the innovation at NIH for the health needs that are coming and the technological needs that are coming? How do we protect national security for our economy to be able to compete in the future?

The President's senior advisers indicated that they would recommend to the President that he veto H.R. 2216 and H.R. 2217, and any other legislation that implements the House deemed budget framework. As I've said time and again, this is no way to run a budget process, and no way to conduct the business of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everyone that we're talking about a rule here. And this rule, different from those that were proposed in the Congresses before I got here, in the 111th Congress, is an open rule. It allows for amendments. If there are those who do not like what's in these bills, they can do everything that they need to do in an amendment and get 218 votes and pass it, and it'll change. If this bill needs perfecting, either one of these bills need perfecting, they can be perfected.

I believe that is as close to regular order as we can get. If we can come down to this floor, offer an amendment, get an opportunity to debate that amendment, have our say, hopefully get the votes to pass it, change the bill, that's the way this process should work.

This rule provides for that. It provides for two very well-thought-out appropriation bills, which may have flaws. But if there are flaws, whether you're a Republican or Democrat, come on down. Once we pass this rule, we'll be taking those bills up one at a time. And any amendment, as long as it's within the germaneness rules of this House, can be offered. We would welcome that. I think both sides would welcome that.

That's why when both of these bills came out of committee, there were glowing reports, both from the minority report and from the majority report. They are well-thought-out bills. They are well-done bills. They are bipartisan. They're done in an open and collaborative way, in an open, real, and regular order process. So for those reasons, I think this is a great rule because it sets forward the opportunity of people on this floor, no matter who they are, from a freshman to a senior Member, from Republican to Democrat, from moderate, liberal, and conservative, no matter who they are, to offer amendments to these bills, both of them. And if they get a majority vote, they can pass them. So I think that to me is an open process. That's also regular order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleague began by saying that's as close to regular order as we can get. I would tell him, close, but no cigar.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my very good friend from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, who has been on the Appropriations Committee at times when we didn't deem things and we did, in fact, pass appropriations measures.

□ 1320

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which would deem the discretionary spending levels in the Ryan budget as law.

The Ryan budget endorses sequestration, is unrealistic, unworkable, economically misguided. The Senate and the White House are using a different set of numbers.

By adopting the rule and the Ryan budget and breaking caps in the Budget Control Act which passed this body, we guarantee gridlock. The House majority will pass a small number of bills at roughly the President's requested levels, but will be unable to get bipartisan support for the remaining bills.

It would also jeopardize our economic recovery. Europeans are experiencing the limits of austerity in the midst of a fragile recovery. We should invest more in education, biomedical research, transportation infrastructure, clean energy and other initiatives that grow our economy and create jobs. Instead, the deeming resolution would take a step back, all but ensuring significant reductions.

To turn off the sequester, ensure the House's relevance in the process, and pass reasonable bills, Democrats offered in committee a motion to postpone consideration of subcommittee allocations until a budget resolution could be confereed.

And I do want to say this, and I would like to say this to my friend, the distinguished Chair on the other side of the House, there has been a call for a budget resolution on the Senate. They did a budget resolution on the Senate that has been requested by my good friends on the other side of the aisle. That budget resolution passed.

However, I know the ranking member of the House Budget Committee, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, has called for a conference, went to the Rules Committee five times and said, Let's have a conference so we can move forward. That was denied.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. So, my colleagues, with a balanced deficit reduction plan, we could establish an alternative allocation that would sufficiently fund our priorities and allow us to follow regular order for the appropriations process.

Instead of my friends engaging today in a futile process—it's just a futile exercise—the House should abide by the discretionary caps in the Budget Control Act. Turn off the sequester before we consider spending bills.

My friends, vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mrs. LOWEY, just before you leave, you have just an additional few seconds. Will the gentlelady yield to me?

Mrs. LOWEY. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just want to say, in addition to the fact that CHRIS VAN HOLLEN came to the Rules Committee five times, HARRY REID has offered eight times to go to conference and Republicans have blocked it. And I just want that to be understood, because later on we're going to hear somebody stand up here and say it's Democrats that are holding it up, and it's not.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. I just want to make a point to my friend on the other side of the aisle: the bill before us today is a bipartisan bill. There was strong support on both sides of the aisle. The chair and the ranking member worked together in a collegial way because this bill is so important for our country.

The problem here is, after this bill and Homeland Security, there's nothing left. Education, National Institutes of Health are in a bill that's going to be cut 22 percent.

So, my friend, the issue is not these bills today; it's the process and the fact there isn't a complete plan in place.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I've been in this process a long time, not necessarily here, but in other venues, and what I have found is what's before you is before you, and what comes later may or may not come later.

But I would say this to the gentlelady, that what we have here are two bills that are bipartisan bills, and they have a great deal of input from both sides. They came out of committee with a strong vote, with both Republicans and Democrats.

And so my thought is: here we are. We're here. We're addressing this particular issue. Now, when these other bills come to the floor of the House, before they get here they're going to pass through the Rules Committee, too, these appropriation bills. I will do everything I can to make them open, also, so that anybody that wants to amend them or perfect them has the opportunity.

I believe in an open process. I believe that Members, no matter how long it takes, should have the opportunity to say their piece. And no matter what your philosophy is, no matter what your party is, no matter what your position is, no matter what your rank is, if you're 435th it doesn't really matter, you should have an opportunity to present your case.

And so, these are these two bills. We have talked about the fact that we're

going to have an open process here, and people want to perfect these bills; then great, offer an amendment. When the other appropriation bills come, that'll be the time to talk about them. But when they do, just know this: I'm going to be one that is going to be pressing hard to have open rules for them, also.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my very good friend, the minority whip of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, what's before us is before us. What's before us is a rule, not the MilCon bill, not Homeland Security.

What's before us is the bill. And what does the bill do?

It doesn't have an open process. It doesn't allow us an amendment. Mr. VAN HOLLEN wanted to have an amendment and say let's go to conference on the budget; let's decide what these numbers ought to be. No, it's our way or the highway.

You've passed a budget. You're going to stick with those numbers. They won't work. You know they won't work. That's why you don't go to conference, because Mr. RYAN knows he couldn't make a deal that he could bring back to this House and your side would vote for, I tell my friend on the Rules Committee.

So what's before us is before us, a ratification of sequester, which starts with "S," which stands for "stupid." It is a terrible process. It is an irrational, commonsense-defying process.

And yet my Republican friends continue to demand that we mark to figures that were contrary to the understanding, agreement—deal, if you want—that we made.

In August of 2011, we made a deal and we said these are going to be the numbers, and the ink was not dry on the paper until such time as you violated that agreement. And the Ryan budget violates it once again and is \$91 billion, almost 9 percent, less than the deal we made.

What's before us is before us, the gentleman says. What's before us is the rule to ratify the sequester.

Now, your side blames the President for it. The President doesn't want the sequester. We don't want the sequester. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who's sitting here, doesn't want the sequester, and he's tried to offer amendments to obviate the sequester and hasn't been allowed to have those amendments on the floor, I tell my friend on the Rules Committee.

And I congratulate him for his position, but he ought to allow the Van Hollen amendment so the House can, in fact, work its will, so that we can, in fact, have a process that will work.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Now, my friend says he's been here for some time and he's participated in another legislative body. Well, I've been here for a long time myself, as the gentleman knows, some 33 years, and 12 years in the Maryland Senate, President of the Senate for the last 4 I was there. So I've been around for some years myself.

The fact is, I will tell the gentleman, there is no possibility you're going to consider all 12 bills because, as the gentlelady said, you're going to run out of money. Why? Because you're front-loading that which you like, and that which you're not too happy about is going to be not only breaking the agreement we made, but far below your own budget numbers because you didn't want to mark to your 966 with this bill.

□ 1330

Why? Because you want to make sure the veterans were taken care of. God bless you. I agree with that. But there's only X number of dollars in that pot, and somebody's going to lose.

What the President is saying is let's consider them all together. That's what we ought to be doing. Reject this bill, reject this sequester, reject this deeming resolution, and let us have a rule that makes common sense for our country.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I will reiterate the fact that it is what is before us. We cannot get to these two bipartisan, well-thought-out, well-debated, well-collaborated pieces of legislation which deal with some issues that are very, very important without passing a rule to allow us to do that. That's what this rule does. It deals with those two bills. No, those two bills aren't before us, but this rule is the gateway to get to those bills. How are we going to get there? We're going to pass this rule. Once we get there, what are we going to do? We're going to have an open process—one that has been foreign until the Republicans took control of this legislature—foreign, no matter what your standing in this body was.

There were closed bills after closed bills after closed bills after closed bills that came up. Was there an opportunity to amend it, to perfect it, to do anything with it? Absolutely not. But that's not the way it is now. If we pass this rule, we're going to get to a process that allows every Member to come down to this floor and offer an amendment, debate that amendment, and have the possibility of passing that amendment.

So, yes, there are other issues, there are other appropriations, there are other bills that will be coming to this floor at some point in time. And at that time we can debate them. But right now, this is the issue before us. These two very important bills—and very much agreed-on bills—are only going to be taken up on this floor if this rule passes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. May I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased and privileged at this time to yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which aims to approve the House majority's inadequate appropriations allocation level for 2014, a level that is over \$90 billion below that of the Senate and the President and violates the agreement that we all voted on a year ago, Democrats and Republicans, in the Budget Control Act to increase that funding above the number that they present to us today.

The budget reflects our values, reflects our priorities, and our responsibilities to the people that we represent. It is our job to make sure that that is the case. And yet for the third time in 3 years, this House majority has put forward a reckless and ideological funding level that ensures that our government cannot even meet its most basic responsibilities to the American people.

Under this House majority's plan, we will see cuts that are deeper than the indiscriminate across-the-board cuts. The funding for the Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services is drastically cut. And this rule accepts those cuts made to the program this year and then it multiplies that by four in 2014. What are those cuts? Where do they fall? And if enacted, the wrong choices will cause incalculable damage. They severely weaken these critical programs that protect public health and safety, that promote and develop our workforce, training programs, education, Pell Grants, Meals on Wheels, special education, and biomedical research so that people can live. It affects our seniors, our veterans, our middle class, and our most vulnerable families.

I, along with Congressman VAN HOLLEN and others, have offered legislation that cuts \$30 billion from the Federal deficit and replaces the deep and indiscriminate cuts for the next 2 years with a more balanced and a targeted approach. That's the direction we should be moving in—keeping up with our fundamental responsibilities to the families who have elected us to stand up for them.

Rather than going down this path, the House majority should appoint budget conferees and do its job and negotiate with the Senate. Our appropriations chairman claims to want to undo sequestration. Yet rather than showing leadership, the House majority fails to address the sequester and create conditions for another budget crisis down the road.

We hear so much talk from this majority about regular order. What does that mean? The House passes a bill, the Senate passes bill, they work out their differences, they get it to the President, and the President signs the bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, where is the regular order? It is autocracy.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. No more games. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this disastrous funding level. Let's work together to fix the sequester and get us back on the path to economic growth. This is our top priority. It must be our top priority. And this House of Representatives needs to show the American people that it can lead.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to reiterate again the benefits of these two bills that we're going to be debating if we pass this rule. They provide critical funding for military construction, housing, schools, and medical facilities for our servicemembers and their families, as well as important veterans programs. They protect security for our airports, seaports, and national border, as well as disaster relief efforts. They also reduce duplication, improve oversight, encourage efficiency, and increase coordination of services.

If there were one provision in a bill that would push you over the edge of voting for or against something, it would be the idea of getting rid of this old paperwork. I've had someone come and tell me that they had gotten a tetanus shot, I think, about 3 weeks before they got out of the service. Once they got out, they went to the VA and they forgot to take the record with them. So they had no proof. They went to the VA and they said, You're going to have to get a tetanus shot. He says, Wait a minute, I've already gotten one. You don't have that record? No. And if you don't have it with you, we don't know. Because you can tell us you had one 3 months ago, but that doesn't matter.

We need to do it. This one bill gets rid of that process and says we're going to move towards a modern system of electronically transferring these records. There's so many good things in these two bills; it's just pretext for the fact that this rule needs to be approved.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, we'll offer an amendment to the rule that strikes the provision of the rule that deems the passage of the Ryan budget and will allow the House to consider the resolution calling on Speaker BOEHNER to proceed to conference on the budget.

It is time for the majority to follow regular House procedure by immediately requesting a conference and appointing conferees to negotiate a fiscal 2014 budget resolution conference agreement with the Senate.

To discuss our proposal, I'm very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. HASTINGS.

I've been listening to Mr. WEBSTER. And if I were Mr. WEBSTER, I'd be doing exactly what he's doing, which is focusing on the underlying bills: the spending bill to support our veterans, to support military construction, and homeland security.

□ 1340

But as others have pointed out, the vote before us is not on those underlying bills. It's on the rule. And everybody needs to understand that what's at play here is a scheme to use the rules to affect not just the veterans budget, but to affect other parts of our budget.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I find it especially cynical that our colleagues would use the spending bills on veterans and military construction as the vehicle to pass their budget levels which will result in dramatic cuts to the parts of the budget that fund our kids' education and that fund the investments in science and research to find cures and treatments to things like cancer, because we know the Appropriations Committee has already set out what the levels for those categories to the budget will be. And do you know what they are? A \$30 billion cut below the sequester level to the parts of the budget that fund our kids' education and that fund that scientific research.

So, yes, this is the rule for two particular bills. They are good bills. The veterans bill is a good bill. But the rule, ladies and gentlemen, has embedded in it the Republican budget levels for the overall budget process. And that's going to hurt education for the kids of those veterans and the family members of those veterans who have diseases whose funding for research is going to be dramatically cut. A 20 percent cut below the sequester level, that's what you're adopting in this rule, a 20 percent cut for the category of the budget on education.

Now, why are we here? We're supposed to have a budget process. The House passed a budget. I don't like the budget, but it passed a budget. The Senate passed a budget. Under the rules of the Congress, in fact, as a matter of law, the House and Senate are supposed to have completed a conference committee by April 15. That was quite a while ago. In fact, it's been over 70 days since the Senate passed a budget and the House passed a budget.

Now, we don't have a House-Senate conference committee report. Why might that be? Well, it turns out that the Speaker of the House has refused to appoint conferees to work with the Senate to come up with a budget. Now, our Republican colleagues beat up for years on the Senate for not having a budget. I can understand that com-

plaint. But the Senate has a budget now, and yet our Republican colleagues refuse to go to conference.

You made a big deal about "no budget, no pay." Guess what? We don't have a budget. We have a House budget and we have a Senate budget, but we don't have a Federal budget, and yet everybody is getting paid. What happened to that?

Now, why would we not want to go to conference? Mr. Speaker, just today in the United States Senate, PATTY MURRAY, the chairwoman for the Budget Committee, for the 11th time tried to get consent to go to conference to work these differences out in a transparent way, blocked by a Republican Senator.

Here is what Senator MCCAIN has had to say about the whole process, because I would urge our colleagues to listen to him. This is a quote from Senator MCCAIN:

I think it's insane for Republicans who complained for 4 years about HARRY REID not having a budget and now we're not going to agree to conference? That is beyond comprehension for me.

And I think it's beyond comprehension for the American people. Why are you sitting on the budget?

So what are we doing in this rule? This rule says let's pretend. Let's make believe that the House and Senate went to conference, and let's pretend that they agree, except let's pretend that they agreed on the House budget numbers, the numbers that would cut the part of the budget that deals with our kids' education by over 20 percent. Let's pretend that because we don't want to go through the normal process. That's what this rule does. It's a total fake. And it's a fake because of the refusal to work these issues out in a transparent manner for the American people.

So, the previous question is a very simple statement. It just says let's comply with the law which says a conference committee was supposed to have met and completed action by April 15; let's at least start down the process of complying with the law. It says that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should follow regular House procedure and immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to negotiate a fiscal year 2014 budget resolution so we can have a real Federal budget, not a fake budget, which is what you're calling for in this rule under the guise of saying let's just fund our veterans.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I find it especially cynical that we would use a good bill to provide spending and support to our veterans as the vehicle to impose this scheme on the Congress which will have terrible, negative effects on other parts of the budget.

Do you know that while this Congress was away, I don't know if people

saw it, but down in Fort Bragg, the home of the 82nd Airborne, they just said that teachers who were going to teach the kids of our servicemen and -women are going to be furloughed for 5 days this fall—for 5 days this fall. So we want to replace the sequester. Let's go to conference and get it done.

I urge my colleagues who said they want a transparent process to vote for our measure.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for yielding me the time.

I hadn't anticipated coming down here today, Mr. Speaker. I came down to listen, but I hadn't anticipated coming down to speak. And I will say to my friend from Maryland his words struck me, because twice in his presentation he said, you know, I think it's especially cynical that we're using this process to bring forward two bills that in a bipartisan way we agree on.

I would say to my friend with a heavy heart, Mr. Speaker, that I think it's especially cynical, since we both know these bills need to be passed, to describe what is happening here in any terms other than that which is exactly necessary in order to get these bills passed.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. Let me get this off my chest, and I'd be happy to yield to my friend. I would be happy to yield when I'm done, because I have a copy of the rule here.

And the gentleman was in the Rules Committee last night, and the gentleman knows this is what section 3 provides, that pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget, we're going to move forward, pending the adoption.

Now, my friend knows, Mr. Speaker, how hard it is to find that agreement. And the reason my friend knows is because I voted for the Budget Control Act in August of 2011, which put my friend and five other Members of the House, it was six House Members, six Senate Members, six Republicans, six Democrats, it put them in a room together for August, September, October, and November with the entire Federal budget over the next 100 years in front of them, allowing them to choose anything they wanted to to agree on to let us move forward as a nation.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Collectively they agreed on not one dollar. I don't fault my friend for that. I know my friend was working as hard as my friend could possibly work to find agreement. But finding agreement is hard. What we're talking about finding agreement with, Mr. Speaker, this comes from The Washington Post editorial page. It's entitled, "The Democrats' complacent budget plan." It says:

Partisan in tone and complacent in substance, the budget scores points against the

Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base but deepens these Senators' commitment to an unsustainable policy agenda.

This is what it is that we're trying to find agreement on. Now, my friend from Maryland knows, in fact, he may have even brought it to my attention yesterday, a letter directing the chairman of the Rules Committee, on which I sit, Mr. Speaker, from the chairman of the Budget Committee, also on which I sit, that's signed by Chairman PAUL RYAN. It says this, over PAUL RYAN's signature:

I want to emphasize that this is a request for an interim measure while the Committee on the Budget continues to work towards an agreement with the Senate on a budget resolution for the coming fiscal year.

And I would, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Maryland, does he doubt the chairman's word when the chairman says this is an interim solution until we find agreement?

I'd be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My colleague, what I know are the facts, which is just today, as I said on the floor, the chairwoman of the Senate Budget Committee, for the 11th time, said to Mr. RYAN, Let's go to conference so we can work out these differences in a public way. And she was blocked over here just like we've been blocked over here.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows that Chairman RYAN has no control over the inside workings of the United States Senate, and Chairman RYAN did not block what was going on in the United States Senate. The United States Senators were blocking it.

I would ask the gentleman again: Does the gentleman doubt the chairman's word? I understand that the gentleman is frustrated about process, and goodness knows, as someone who supports open rules, I'm frustrated with process, too. We have that in common. But notwithstanding that process, what I have here is a letter from a man which you and I both support—and "support," I mean we believe in his integrity. And he tells us that he is working towards a solution and that what we're doing here today is just an interim step to get these bills that we all agree are so very important, we all agree are so very important, the interim step to get these moving down the process.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would yield to ask the gentleman does he disagree with the commitment made by the chairman? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I'm not questioning the integrity of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

This is not just about process. As I indicated, you adopt this rule and you're essentially applying a 20 percent cut below sequester to the part of the budget that deals with our kids' education and science and research. So this is way beyond process.

□ 1350

So this is way beyond process.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that's just not the case.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That is the case. The gentleman should go read the Appropriations Committee 302(b) allocations.

Mr. WOODALL. I'm aware of the Appropriations Committee 302(b) allocations. And what I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to have those allocations to begin the process. The gentleman is talking about where we are going to finish the process on October 1. I'm trying to get it started today. The gentleman knows that we can't get started.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Why are those levels at the levels they are? Would the gentleman answer that question?

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

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

I want to quote what one of my Democratic colleagues quoted last night in the Rules Committee, and that's Federalist Paper No. 58, written by James Madison for the Independent Journal back on February 20, 1788. And he said this:

This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

Because that's the constitutional responsibility of this body, Mr. Speaker, to appropriate these dollars. This process of appropriations, this constitutional responsibility, cannot begin until we have some numbers against which to budget and appropriate.

What my chairman on the Budget Committee has asked is that as an interim step, and an interim step only, we adopt these numbers today on bills about which we all agree. What is cynical, Mr. Speaker, is that these are things on which we all agree, and we're using this as a position to talk about other issues about which we disagree.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield, because we don't agree on cutting the kids' education budget?

Mr. WOODALL. As my friend knows from his time having to negotiate on the joint select, what we'll call the supercommittee, my friends at The Washington Post go on to say:

In short, this document—

Talking about the budget passed by the Senate.

—gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

Now, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that gives me great concern about whether

we will be able to reach agreement with the Senate. As my friend from Maryland knows, Mr. Speaker, the House budget reduces spending by trillions of dollars and the Senate budget increases spending even more. In many years, it spends more than even the President requested.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. As my friend from Maryland knows, we keep tax revenues the same and the Senate increases taxes by almost \$1 trillion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I just want to know why you're afraid to go to conference. Why is that? That's what this is about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say, first, as a member of both the Appropriations and the Budget Committees, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The allocations provided under this rule will savage vital programs that protect the public health and safety, promote and develop our workforce, and educate the next generation of Americans.

Sequester cuts are already hitting low-income families throughout our country and also in my congressional district in my home State of California. And every single household in America, especially the millions of Americans who are struggling still to find a job, these cuts are hitting them disproportionately.

Our economy cannot afford these cuts. Hungry children do not deserve these cuts. Students who depend on Pell Grants, TRIO, and Head Start do not deserve these cuts. And certainly, our seniors and our veterans do not deserve these cuts.

The Military Construction-Veterans bill on the floor this week assumes the sequester cuts have been replaced. Why in the world can't we do this for the other bills as well? We all know that the allocation for the rest of the subcommittees will make it nearly impossible to fund education, senior programs, infrastructure, and job creation. While all of us believe it is important to keep the government functioning, governing by a continuing resolution is really no way to run the Federal Government, and that is exactly what course we are on unless we come to some agreement.

The majority claims that they care about the middle class and the poor, yet these cuts really do begin to erode the middle class and force more people into poverty. So it's time for Congress to reject these draconian cuts and replace the sequester with a bipartisan agreement on the budget resolution to create jobs and to lift the economy for all.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. We need to vote "no" on the rule, and we need to go back to the drawing board.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that last discussion was worth paying the price to come here. But I would like to say this, to bring it back to where we are, and that is:

We have before us a rule. This rule is going to be the gateway—the gateway—to an open process. That open process, when it opens up, is beautiful to behold. We have two bills that will be heard. Both of those bills are going to be able to be amended by any Member that would like to do it. And to me, that is what I have searched for, and I think it's a great thing.

We have the opportunity to come to this floor, agree or disagree, but in the end we will produce a product that was put together by a bipartisan group of members of two different committees of the Appropriations Committee. And it went through the regular process. Bringing it to the floor with an open rule is the regular process. That is why I'm supporting this rule, because the rule gives the gateway to us doing those bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleague that I have no further speakers, and I'm prepared to close. So I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have to ask the question at the beginning that Mr. VAN HOLLEN has persisted in asking, and I as well and others: Why are you afraid to go to conference? I have no idea why you can't do that and follow the regular order.

I agree with my colleague that this bipartisan measure is a very good thing that we are bringing here, but I also agree with other speakers that when we finish doing these two bills—and I predict for my friend that we will not reach a single other measure of appropriations for the reason that if you're going to cut 22 percent from everything else and you're going to hold harmless the things that you and I like, then be assured we are in serious trouble as the appropriations process moves forward.

We have a responsibility to implement a budget framework that supports programs which help Americans provide for their families, to stay in their homes, and remain competitive in the global economy. The Ryan budget picks winners and losers, and we are picking two winners today, and we are going to have 11 losers on down the road.

"Deem and pass" did not work the last Congress, it didn't work when Democrats thought that they could try it, and it ain't gonna work now. It is long past time that House Republicans work together with Democrats in conference, just as these two committees did, to negotiate a budget and put an end to the devastating sequester.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extra-

neous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I'm prepared to yield back the balance of my time after I ask the question one more time: Why are you afraid to go to conference?

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit two letters into the RECORD.

The first letter is from the Budget Committee chairman, PAUL RYAN. In his letter, Chairman RYAN asks the Rules Committee to follow standard practice by addressing budget enforcement pending a conference report on the budget resolution. To prevent greater uncertainty and further delays in the appropriations process, House Resolution 243 will include a provision and does include a provision that adopts the House-passed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 25, as an interim budget enforcement measure until an agreement may be reached with the Senate on the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year.

I would like to read an excerpt from that letter. This is from Chairman RYAN to Chairman SESSIONS, who is the Rules Committee chairman:

As you know, the budget passed by the House reduces spending by \$4.6 trillion and achieves balance in 2023—all without raising taxes on the American people. In contrast, the budget resolution adopted by the Senate raises taxes by over \$900 billion, increases spending by \$265 billion and never balances. While I continue to work with my Senate counterpart to find common ground, we have not yet been able to reach agreement.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Let me finish this first.

Another part of that reads:

Until such time as we are able to reach agreement and consistent with the practice in previous years when the House and Senate have been delayed in completing action on a budget resolution, I am asking that the rule include a provision that adopts the House-passed budget resolution as an interim budget enforcement measure that will allow the appropriations process to proceed without further delay.

The second letter is just a response from Representative SESSIONS, who is the chair of the Rules Committee, acknowledging that the rule would include the requested interim budget enforcement measure.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I just have a simple question, which is: How is it that we are going to get agreement from the House and the Senate in a conference

committee if the Speaker of the House continues to refuse to go to conference? How are we going to get that agreement?

The reason we don't have a conference committee budget report and you have to use this device is that there is no conference, and the reason there is no conference is that our Republican colleagues in the House refuse to appoint conferees, which is why we want to pass this amendment and let the Members vote on whether or not we go to conference.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I reclaim my time and will not yield any more time after this.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am not involved in that process. However, I can tell you this: I was a speaker at one point in time in a different body and at a different time in my career. Even if a conference committee has not been formed, there are discussions that go on. Then, eventually, there will be a conference committee, and things work out, but it doesn't necessarily mean that nothing is happening. I think things are happening. I think they are working on solutions. We have to have a solution at some point in time, and that's happening.

This resolution provides for an open rule to allow all Members to offer their ideas and to debate them through regular order. Two underlying bills fund necessary programs that train, equip, house, and support the brave men and women who sacrificially defend our freedoms, and the bills also support their families. Our debt of gratitude to these individuals does not expire when they retire, as the legislation also funds important programs to provide benefits and medical care for our veterans. Additionally, the legislation equips our Coast Guard and supports the individuals who guard our borders, secure our airports and seaports, and who respond to natural disasters.

However, we would be doing a great disservice, Mr. Speaker, to future generations if we were to fail to consider the effect our current spending will have on the future fiscal health and safety of our Nation. For that reason, these bills reduce costs, require the coordination of medical care and ensure the efficient operation of those critical programs so that we may continue to support those who protect us.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this rule and in the passage of the underlying bills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 31, 2013.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday you announced that the Committee on Rules will meet on June 3 to report a rule to govern the floor consideration of the first appropriations bills for fiscal year 2014. I am writing to ask that you include in that rule a provision providing for the enforcement of the concurrent resolution on the budget as passed by the House (H. Con. Res. 25) until

such time as the House adopts a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

As you know, the budget passed by the House reduces spending by \$4.6 trillion and achieves balance in 2023—all without raising taxes on the American people. In contrast, the budget resolution adopted by the Senate raises taxes by over \$900 billion, increases spending by \$265 billion, and never balances. While I continue to work with my Senate counterpart to find common ground, we have not yet been able to reach agreement.

Until such time as we are able to reach agreement and consistent with the practice in previous years when the House and Senate have been delayed in completing action on a budget resolution, I am asking that the rule include a provision that adopts the House-passed budget resolution as an interim budget-enforcement measure that will allow the appropriations process to proceed without further delay.

Pursuant to the authority provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and in title VI of the House-passed concurrent resolution on the budget and consistent with long-standing practice, once the House passes the rule adopting the House-passed budget resolution, as the Budget Committee Chairman I intend to file the allocations and adjustments in the Congressional Record to put in force such concurrent resolution.

To ensure the Rules Committee and House members have full transparency on the budget levels that would be enforced, enclosed are the relevant budget aggregates and committee allocations that I will file if the House adopts the rule. The House-passed budget resolution was based on CBO February budget projections and estimates. The funding levels for global war on terror (GWOT)/overseas contingency operations (OCO) and for veterans programs were based on an extrapolation of the President's budget request from last year. Because the House acted on the budget resolution before CBO had completed its updated budget projections and before the President had submitted his fiscal year 2014 budget request, the resolution provided authority for the Chairman to adjust the relevant levels in the resolution to reflect CBO's updated budget projections and the President's request for GWOT/OCO and veterans advance appropriations. The adjustments for CBO's updated baseline will be limited to changes due to updated technical estimates. Now that we have CBO's revised baseline projections and the President's budget request, it is possible to update the levels in the House-passed budget resolution to reflect this updated information. Enclosed are tables showing aggregate budget and committee allocations that will be used for budget enforcement purposes.

I want to emphasize that this is a request for an interim measure while the Committee on the Budget continues to work toward an agreement with the Senate on a budget resolution for the coming fiscal year. The nation's fiscal problems cannot be addressed solely through the appropriations process and the budget remains the critical vehicle for identifying a solution.

To ensure full transparency as to my intent should this request be granted, I ask that you include this letter and the enclosures in the Rules Committee's record of consideration of the rule. I appreciate your consideration. If there are any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Committee on the Budget.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year	
	2014	2014–2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,755,317	1
Outlays	2,810,979	1
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015–2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2014	
ID Base Discretionary Action:		
BA	966,924	
OT	1,117,675	
Global War on Terrorism:		
BA	92,289	
OT	48,010	
Total Discretionary Action:		
BA	1,059,213	
OT	1,165,685	
Current Law Mandatory:		
BA	749,400	
OT	738,140	

RESOLUTION BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

	2014	2014–2023
Agriculture:		
Current Law:		
BA	92,956	906,903
OT	89,341	900,800
Resolution Change:		
BA	–2,631	–209,044
4OT	–2,501	–208,556
Total:		
BA	86,840	692,244
Armed Services:		
Current Law:		
BA	150,138	1,764,863
OT	149,922	1,768,772
Resolution Change:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Total:		
4BA	150,138	1,764,863
OT	149,922	1,768,772
Financial Services:		
Current Law:		
BA	12,981	114,942
OT	2,112	–57,397
Resolution Change:		
BA	–11,465	–94,439
OT	–10,428	–94,325
Total:		
BA	1,516	20,503
OT	–8,316	–151,722
Education & Workforce:		
Current Law:		
BA	–25,740	–661
OT	–18,800	2,383
Resolution Change:		
BA	–21,712	–217,458
BA	–7,430	–198,921
Total:		
BA	–47,452	–218,119
OT	–26,230	–196,538
Energy & Commerce:		
Current Law:		
BA	356,892	4,936,804
BA	356,892	4,936,804
OT	354,784	4,935,838
Resolution Change:		
BA	–22,996	–1,604,166
OT	–20,659	–1,596,356
Total:		
BA	333,896	3,332,638
OT	334,125	3,339,482
Foreign Affairs:		
Current Law:		
BA	29,118	241,385
OT	26,085	235,012
Resolution Change:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Total:		
BA	29,118	241,385
OT	26,085	235,012

RESOLUTION BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE—Continued
(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

	2014	2014–2023
Oversight & Government Reform:		
Current Law:		
BA	102,657	1,199,434
OT	99,645	1,170,525
Resolution Change:		
BA	–11,758	–165,996
OT	–11,758	–165,996
Total:		
BA	90,899	1,033,438
OT	87,887	1,004,529
Homeland Security:		
Current Law:		
BA	1,916	22,255
OT	1,779	22,321
Resolution Change:		
BA	–305	–12,575
OT	–305	–12,575
Total:		
BA	1,611	9,680
OT	1,474	9,746
House Administration:		
Current Law:		
BA	40	371
OT	6	206
Resolution Change:		
BA	–34	–295
OT	0	–130
Total:		
BA	6	76
OT	6	76
Natural Resources:		
Current Law:		
BA	6,441	63,590
OT	7,069	66,964
Resolution Change:		
BA	–900	–17,995
OT	–632	–17,225
Total:		
BA	5,541	45,595
OT	6,437	49,739
Judiciary:		
Current Law:		
BA	19,809	102,678
OT	11,573	105,537
Resolution Change:		
BA	–11,506	–47,461
OT	–637	–45,809
Total:		
BA	8,303	55,217
OT	10,936	59,728
Transportation & Infrastructure:		
Current Law:		
BA	71,454	728,035
OT	16,822	193,098
Resolution Change:		
BA	–78	–116,444
OT	–47	–951
Total:		
BA	71,376	611,591
OT	16,775	192,147
Science, Space & Technology:		
Current Law:		
BA	101	1,010
OT	104	1,013
Resolution Change:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Total:		
BA	101	1,010
OT	104	1,013
Small Business:		
Current Law:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Resolution Change:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Total:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Veterans Affairs:		
Current Law:		
BA	2,939	93,544
OT	3,098	95,206
Resolution Change:		
BA	0	0
OT	0	0
Total:		
BA	2,939	93,544
OT	3,098	95,206
Ways & Means:		
Current Law:		
BA	963,421	14,458,848

RESOLUTION BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE—Continued
(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

	2014	2014–2023
OT	962,271	14,455,530
Resolution Change:		
BA	–22,567	–1,298,202
OT	–21,667	–1,291,946
Total:		
BA	940,854	13,160,646
OT	940,604	13,163,584

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE
APPROPRIATIONS

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE
APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(Subject to a General Limit of \$28,852,000,000)

Payment to Postal Service

Employment and Training Administration
Education for the Disadvantaged
School Improvement Programs
Special Education
Career, Technical and Adult Education

Tenant-based Rental Assistance
Project-based Rental Assistance

VETERANS ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE
APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(Subject to a Separate Limit of \$55,634,227)

VA Medical Services
VA Medical Support and Compliance
VA Medical Facilities

COMMITTEE ON RULES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2013.

CHAIRMAN PAUL RYAN,
*Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter of May 31, 2013. I appreciate your desire and commitment to achieving a final resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 with the Senate. Your leadership on the budget challenges facing the Nation is unmatched.

I agree with you that, pending a conference report on the budget, it is both timely and proper to ensure that we have the necessary budget enforcement mechanisms in place as we begin the annual appropriations process. Despite the fact that the President's Budget was submitted more than two months after the statutory deadline, we must move forward on the annual appropriations process if we have any hope of meeting the deadlines imposed by the end of the fiscal year.

To that end, I intend to recommend to the Committee on Rules that we agree to your request for the inclusion of budget enforcement language in the rule that will be considered by the Committee later today. This will allow you to continue your negotiations with the Senate and allow the House to begin its work on the appropriations bills, which I believe is a responsible approach.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 2216, Military Construction/VA Appropriations act for FY 2014.

I oppose the rule because it adheres to the draconian spending limits imposed by the Ryan Budget resolution rather than more realistic and responsible limits to be negotiated and agreed to by House and Senate budget conferees.

Indeed, the Republican House leadership has refused for months to appoint conferees empowered to reach a budget agreement that is fair, balanced and would end sequestration.

I agree with President Obama that prior to consideration of appropriations bills the House

and Senate should first reach agreement on an appropriate framework for all appropriations bills and one does not harm our economy or require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities.

Without such an agreement, House Republican appropriation bills will result in: hundreds of thousands of low-income children losing access to Head Start programs; tens of thousands of children with disabilities losing federal funding for their special education teachers and aides; thousands of federal agents who will not be able to secure the border, enforce drug laws, combat violent crime or apprehend fugitives; and thousands of scientists without medical grants to conduct research to find new treatments and cures for diseases like breast cancer and Alzheimer's.

As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the Senate to ensure that our firefighters and other first responders have the resources needed to keep the American people safe.

But I oppose this rule and urge all Members to join me in voting against it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 243 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Strike Section 3, and insert the following new sections:

Sec. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 174) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to complete work on a fiscal year 2014 budget resolution with the Senate. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of consideration of the resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the resolution.

Sec. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the resolution specified in section 3 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]
YEAS—229

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Petri
Alexander	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Amash	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Amodei	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Guthrie	Pompeo
Bachus	Hall	Posey
Barletta	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barr	Harper	Radel
Barton	Harris	Reed
Benishek	Hartzler	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Black	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Bonner	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jones	Rothfus
Camp	Jordan	Royce
Cantor	Joyce	Runyan
Capito	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (IA)	Salmon
Cassidy	King (NY)	Sanford
Chabot	Kingston	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kinzie (IL)	Schock
Coble	Kline	Schweikert
Coffman	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Conaway	Lankford	Simpson
Cook	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cotton	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Long	Southerland
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stewart
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Daines	Lummis	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stutzman
Denham	Marino	Terry
Dent	Massie	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McCaul	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Tipton
Duffy	McHenry	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Valadao
Ellmers	McMorris	Wagner
Farenthold	Rodgers	Walberg
Fincher	Meadows	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walorski
Fleischmann	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Mica	Webster (FL)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Fox	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Pearce	
Graves (GA)	Perry	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Barber	Bishop (NY)	Bustos
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Bass	Bonamici	Capps
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Cárdenas
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Carney

Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Chu	Jeffries	Peters (CA)
Ciциlline	Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Clay	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Keating	Pocan
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Cohen	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kildee	Quigley
Conyers	Kilmer	Rahall
Cooper	Kind	Richmond
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kuster	Ruiz
Crowley	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
Delaney	Loebsock	Schneider
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schrader
DeBene	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Dingell	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Doyle	(NM)	Serrano
Duckworth	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)
Edwards	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Lynch	Sherman
Engel	Maffei	Sinema
Enyart	Maloney,	Sires
Eshoo	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Farr	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Fattah	Matsui	Takano
Foster	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	McGovern	Tierney
Gabbard	McIntyre	Titus
Galleo	McNerney	Tonko
Garamendi	Meeks	Tsongas
Garcia	Meng	Van Hollen
Grayson	Michaud	Vargas
Green, Al	Miller, George	Veasey
Green, Gene	Moore	Vela
Grijalva	Moran	Velázquez
Gutierrez	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Hahn	Nadler	Walz
Hanabusa	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Schultz
Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Higgins	Nolan	Waxman
Himes	O'Rourke	Welch
Hinojosa	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Holt	Pallone	Yarmuth
Horsford	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Honda	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Markey	Slaughter
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)	Watt
Granger	Rangel	

□ 1430

Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SINEMA, and Messrs. FOSTER and MCGOVERN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NUNNELEE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

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

NAYS—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (FL)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa

Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel

Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis

Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus
Campbell
Deutch
Granger

Honda
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Rangel

Sanchez, Loretta
Slaughter
Watt
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1437

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 186 and 187. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote Nos. 186 and 187.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY
MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2013.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to title VI of House Concurrent Resolution 25 (113th Congress), the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, which was put into effect by House Res-

olution 243 (113th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregates, allocations and other budgetary levels set forth pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as put into effect by House Resolution 243.

These revisions are provided for bills, joint resolutions, and amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, considered by the House subsequent to this filing, as applicable.

The adjustments made by this communication are pursuant to the terms of the H. Con. Res. 25. They are made in order to take into account new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014 for the following: veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report on H. Con. Res. 25, as deemed in force, to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of that Act).

The chair of the Committee on the Budget is also permitted to adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

The adjustments made by this communication are pursuant to the authority granted in section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25. The adjusted levels also incorporate a technical correction to the committee allocations included in House Report 113-17 to accurately reflect the levels of the budget resolution.

Associated tables are attached. These adjustments are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these adjustments to the aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in the concurrent resolution on the budget, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

Sincerely,
PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE LEVELS IN HOUSE
REPORT 113-17

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year	
	2014	2014-2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,755,317	1
Outlays	2,810,979	1
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

¹Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015-2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	966,924
OT	1,117,675
Global War on Terrorism	
BA	92,289
OT	48,010
Total Discretionary Action	
BA	1,059,213
OT	1,165,685
Current Law Mandatory	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140