

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Cicilline
Conyers
Crawford
DeLauro
Farr

Gabbard
McDermott
McNerney
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

□ 1440

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 34 I missed the vote because I was meeting with a constituent in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of February 5, 2013, upon request of

a leave of absence, a series of votes were held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have cast the following votes: On Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 48, Providing for consideration of H.R. 444, to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (rollcall No. 33)—I vote "nay." On Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 48, Providing for consideration of H.R. 444, to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes (rollcall No. 34)—I vote "no."

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 53

Resolved, That the following Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Cole, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Ribble, Mr. Flores, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Woodall, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Nunelee, Mr. Renacci, Mr. Rigell, Mrs. Hartzler, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Messer, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, and Mr. Williams.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January

3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut

REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 444.

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

□ 1447

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1450

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

I commend Congressman PRICE for introducing this bill, and I join my colleagues in supporting its passage, but I wish it hadn't come to this.

President Obama has a legal and a moral obligation to offer solutions to our fiscal challenges. So far, that hasn't happened. In using the numbers from his last budget proposal, the Federal budget would not have achieved balance ever, and, just yesterday, he missed the statutory deadline to submit his budget for the fourth time in 5 years. Since this administration started, we've added nearly \$6 trillion to our national debt. That's the largest increase in history.

Look, we can't keep this up, Mr. Chairman. We have to budget responsibly so that we can keep our commitments and expand opportunity. All we

are simply saying here is that we need to put our plans on the table.

House Republicans have shown our solutions. The Senate hasn't passed a budget in 4 years. The President hasn't even submitted a budget yet even though it's past the deadline, and when he has submitted a budget, it has proposed that it never, ever, ever balances the budget. Isn't that what budgeting is—showing how you'll get your budget under control so that your expenditures and your revenues eventually, one day, meet? That, unfortunately, hasn't been happening. As a result, we have a debt crisis on our horizon.

In this bill, we don't say what policies the President must propose; we realize that he'll have his own. All we're saying is that he needs to bring ideas to the table. Show us how you'll balance the budget and when you'll balance the budget. It says to simply bring a plan, and show us how you'll balance the budget so that we can have the kind of honest debate we need to have.

The way things ought to be, the way the Framers intended things to be, was that the House passes its solution and that the Senate passes theirs, and in the budget process, the President offers his. When people put their solutions on the table, that's how you find common ground, that's how you get things done. But if it's a one-way conversation in which all you have is one side of the aisle putting solutions on the table and the other side of the aisle simply offering criticisms and no solutions to ever balance the budget, that gets you no progress. Unfortunately, that's precisely where we are today. That's why we're calling for this legislation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the remainder of my time and the ability to control such time to the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just have to say to my colleagues that, in looking at this bill, it represents exactly what the American people hate most about this body and this Congress. It's a political gimmick that does absolutely nothing to help create jobs. It does nothing to help boost economic growth. If you read the bill, it is another finger-pointing exercise: blaming the President for the late submission of the 2014 budget and demanding not that the President submit a budget—the President is going to submit a budget—but that he submit it in a form dictated by House Republicans rather than dictated by current law.

Now, our Republican colleagues know very well why the President's 2014 budget is late. It's late because we had

a big debate in this country over how to avoid the fiscal cliff, and it wasn't until January 2 that this House and the Senate were able to resolve that issue. If we'd gone over the fiscal cliff, it would have created huge economic problems. It would have created a huge contraction. It would have created a huge loss of jobs.

Now, even though a majority of Republican Senators voted for the agreement to prevent us from going over that fiscal cliff, our House Republican colleagues argued against it and against it, and at the end of the day, they were prepared to let the economy go over that cliff in order to protect tax breaks for very wealthy people. A great majority of our Republican colleagues here in the House voted against that fiscal agreement, but we got it done despite that fact. As a result, the economy has continued to move. Now we need to work to make it move faster, but this bill does absolutely nothing to help do that. That's why the budget is a little late, because most Americans know that, unless you know both what your expenditures are going to be and your revenues, you can't submit a budget, and we didn't know until January 2 what the revenue number would be going forward.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office and the nonpartisan Joint Tax Committee have also been delayed in presenting their backgrounds, which have just come out today but were delayed from when they had planned to do it, and it was because of that very reason.

What's really a shame is that here we are on the floor of the House, debating this gimmick, when we should be doing things to help the economy and help grow jobs. On March 1, less than 1 month from today, we're going to see these automatic across-the-board, meat-ax cuts take place to both defense and non-defense. Now, those across-the-board cuts are going to do great damage to jobs and the economy.

You don't have to take my word for it. Here are the words of the Republican House leader, Mr. CANTOR, just a few months ago: "Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made." According to a study which he referred to, "The jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians in my home State are on the line."

And that's just jobs in Virginia. He was just talking about jobs lost from the defense cuts. If we don't act to replace the sequester, you're going to see jobs lost around the country. In fact, we're already seeing what would happen from even the threat of the sequester, because, in the last quarter, we saw the economy slowing. Many analysts have said it's because of the fear of these across-the-board cuts—and not just many analysts. The Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. MCKEON, said this in referring to the last quarter economic

report: "This is just the first indicator of the extraordinary economic damage defense cuts will do."

Mr. MCKEON is right. So why are we spending our time today on a bill that doesn't address that at all?

We have not in this Congress, the 113th Congress, had any debate on any measure to replace the sequester—our Republican colleagues haven't brought that to the floor—but it gets worse. Even though our Republican colleagues haven't brought their proposal to the floor of this House to replace the sequester in this Congress, we presented an alternative to the Rules Committee to replace the sequester and to do it in a balanced way, and we were denied an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote here in this Chamber today on that proposal to replace the sequester for the remainder of this fiscal year so that we would avoid those across-the-board, meat-ax cuts and avoid the job losses that both Mr. CANTOR and Mr. MCKEON talked about.

We had a proposal to avoid all that—not even a vote today—and we proposed to do it in a balanced way, Mr. Chairman: to make some cuts to some of the big agriculture subsidies' direct payments, also with some revenue by closing taxpayer breaks for the big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues continue to stick to the position that they won't close one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not one. They conceded in the last election that very wealthy individuals benefit from those tax breaks disproportionately, but they don't want to eliminate one of them for the purpose of reducing the deficit in a balanced way, combined with additional spending cuts, which is what our substitute amendment would do. It's important for the people to know that we didn't have a chance to vote on it.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's a sad reflection on this body that we are here debating a meaningless political action and ignoring the real work of the American people in this country to deal with the sequester in a balanced way and to prevent the job losses which Republican Members of this Congress have themselves said are on the horizon if we don't take that action.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Maryland makes some interesting points. The problem with many of them is that they simply aren't true.

For example, the Congressional Budget Office gave their report on the economic situation today, and they have met their deadline, so contrary to what the gentleman from Maryland said.

The gentleman also knows that the amendment that he offered, that he just cited that wasn't to be made in order, was not germane. The rules of the House precluded that.

And then he spent the majority of his time, Mr. Chairman, talking about the sequester, which is an important issue, there's no doubt about it, but it's not this issue. In fact, House Republicans passed a reconciliation bill last year that outlined the spending priorities that we would have, the spending reduction priorities that we would place in place of the sequester, and that sat over in the Senate. So the ball is in the Senate's court, the ball is in the President's court.

Today we're talking about H.R. 444, which is a bill that simply says to the President, Mr. President, when you submit your budget, just let us know when it balances—10 years, 20 years, 40 years, 75 years. When does it balance? Just be honest and transparent with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are the minority party here in Washington. Yes, we have the majority in the House, but we don't have the majority in the Senate. We certainly don't control the White House. One of the roles of the minority is to provide accountability to the other side and to provide a contrast.

Well, as Mr. RYAN said in his opening remarks, it's tough to have a contrast when you have specific legislation and you're comparing it to a speech. It doesn't work. The American people can't tell who's telling the truth and whose policies they would prefer. That's why we believe it's imperative—in fact, it's the only fair thing to do—to have the President, when he submits his budget, to say, in fact, this is when it balances.

And it's instructive to know, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, that the past four budgets that the President has proposed have never come to balance, never. That's important information, Mr. Chairman. It's time for the President to admit that.

So the record of the President isn't great, as you well know, on this: \$6 trillion of new debt on his watch, 4 straight years of trillion-dollar-plus annual deficits, more borrowing, more spending, more debt, more dreams crushed.

House Republicans have done our job. We put forward two budgets over the past 2 years when we've been in the majority in which we have said this is exactly how we would reform, save, strengthen, and secure the programs that are so necessary for this country, but also how we would get this country on a path to balance, not for balance's sake, but because families do it, businesses do it, and economies that don't demonstrate balance cannot be vibrant, cannot create jobs, cannot allow individuals to realize their dreams. So, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 444 is a common-sense piece of legislation.

The gentleman from Maryland talked a lot about what the American people want. The polling industry, just earlier last month, said 72 percent of the Americans say that reducing the budget deficit is a, quote, top priority for

the President and the Congress this year. It should be. Seventy-two percent.

Mr. Chairman, we're on the side of the American people. It's time for the President to show us a budget that balances or to state simply when his budget balances.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There's no doubt that it's a priority of the American people, 72 percent of the American people, to reduce the deficit. We need to reduce the deficit.

In fact, in the last election, both candidates talked about their plans for how to reduce that deficit in a smart and measured way. The American people spoke, and they said they preferred the balanced approach that the President has laid out that includes a combination of cuts. And, by the way, we did more than \$1.5 trillion of cuts through the combination of the Budget Control Act and the supplementals in the last 2 or 3 years. We've already done that. We need to keep making more cuts. And, in fact, our substitute proposal includes additional cuts.

But in the last election, the American people also said that we should close some of these tax breaks for special interests and very wealthy people. And yet our Republican colleagues have taken the position, the ironclad position, that you can't close or eliminate one of those tax breaks that their Presidential candidate and Vice Presidential candidate talked about if you want to use that for the purpose of reducing the deficit. You can't do it.

So, yes, we need to reduce the deficit. The President has a plan to do it. He just doesn't do it the way our Republican colleagues would do it, which is by whacking Social Security and Medicaid, and by shortchanging important investments in our education and in our kids' future.

So, yes, reduce the deficit, but let's do it in a sensible way. And the President has the prerogative of getting to put forward his budget the way he would like to present it to Congress, and then Congress can do its work however it wants.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague from Maryland, and someone who has been very focused on reducing our deficits in a responsible way, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia said what the American people want. What the American people don't want is games. This is a game. This is a sham. This is a shame.

What the American people want is honest legislation to address the challenges that confront us. In 23 or 24 days, we are going to face a sequester. That sequester, as has been pointed out, Mr. CANTOR and I agree on, it will have devastating, adverse, negative

consequences for our economy, for the American people, and for the confidence of America.

But we are not spending time to avoid the sequester. Mr. PRICE of Georgia, in fact, says this is not about the sequester. He's right.

Mr. RYAN said the Founding Fathers. The Founding Fathers had no idea and no intention the President of the United States would be involved in the budgeting process, period, none. Read the Constitution, my friends. I've heard a lot about that. The Founding Fathers thought it would be the legislative body, and the legislative body alone, that would have responsibility. It wasn't, frankly, until the last century that the President played a significant role in the budget, because the Founding Fathers, if you read the Constitution, thought, under Article I, we were responsible.

And now, my friends, we have a game. My friend from Georgia, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, said that we want a contrast. You have a contrast. You didn't want a contrast. You didn't make it in order, because you don't want the contrast.

What you want is your political messaging bill that at the end of the day will do zip, nada, zero to address the problems confronting America. It's a game. Sadly, it's a game because the American people deserve and need better from us—more responsibility, more reality, more honesty in the actions we take on this floor. This is a political messaging bill. It's not even a very big bill.

By the way, the bill to which the gentleman from Georgia referred is not before this Congress. It was the last Congress. That Congress, I tell the gentleman, is over. But we have a responsibility in the 113th Congress to act responsibly, not just to point to what was or was not done in the 112th Congress.

This is a political messaging bill, Mr. Chairman, pure and simple. It does nothing to solve the most immediate problem we are now facing that is the looming sequester and all the uncertainty it is causing.

What we ought to be working on this week is a bipartisan solution to the sequester that averts the negative cuts, the adverse consequences that will take place, as I said, 23 to 24 days from now. Instead, Mr. Chairman, we hear not only silence from many on the Republican side, but irresponsible acquiescence.

Yesterday Republicans brought consideration of an amendment by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, that would replace the sequester with spending cuts and additional revenue, a balanced package. Now, my Republican friends probably would have voted against that, but they didn't even allow the contrast of which the gentleman from Georgia speaks. Why? Because they want a unilateral message for their hardline constituents. That is why, Mr.

Chairman. And it's a shame, because the American people and our economy are suffering because of these actions.

□ 1510

This is very disappointing, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN's amendment is exactly the approach we ought to consider on this floor.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. And the President of the United States, for contrast, I tell my friend from Georgia, supports this exact alternative.

Will he support others in a compromise? He will. But this is the alternative that he supports, so it's the contrast that the gentleman seeks.

I suggest perhaps we ask unanimous consent that they change their mind. To do so would be devastating, if we don't fix the sequester, to our economy and our ability to create opportunities for America.

It's time that our friends in the majority in this House stop pretending that the sequester is not dangerous or that it can be a viable tool to achieve the fiscal discipline we need. It's not that tool and, in fact, it's very dangerous.

As we move closer toward the March 1 deadline, I want to tell my friend from Georgia, whom I respect, that I would hope that we could engage in a positive discussion and consideration on this floor of an alternative like Mr. VAN HOLLEN's, not because you will support it, but because it is a viable, effective alternative, and then you provide an effective alternative. There is no alternative in the bill you provide on this floor today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to that debate as well, but that's not the debate that we're having today. The debate that we're having today is a serious debate about whether or not we're going to get our fiscal house in order and whether or not the President's going to engage in a positive way. The President has put forward budgets that have not shown balance at all, ever.

This is a serious debate. This is not a game. This is a serious debate about a serious issue. The same words were used by the gentleman on the bill that we had on the floor 2 weeks ago, the No Budget, No Pay Act. That was such a game that the Senate passed it and the President signed it.

No, Mr. Chairman, this is serious business, and the American people know it, and they know that it's time for the President and the Democratic-controlled Senate to step up and do their job.

I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding and for bringing forward the Require a PLAN Act.

You know, when our colleagues on the other side talk about games and all of these things that are frustrating and angering the American people, what angers them the most is when they don't see Washington doing their job.

The law says the President, the House, and the Senate have to produce a budget. Now, the House has met its legal obligation the last 2 years; the Senate, they've failed to produce a budget in 4 years; and the President has missed his legal deadline 4 of the last 5 years.

One of my colleagues said that somehow it's the Republicans' fault this year that the President didn't produce the budget on time. Okay. If that's the case, then that means 3 of the other 4 years is he going to blame, like, maybe the dog ate his homework, or maybe blame it on President Bush? At some point, this President's got to take responsibility and live by the same laws that American families live by.

You know, American families, at the end of each year, they sit around the house kitchen table and they do a budget. They actually figure out what their priorities are going to be. And they look to Washington and they see a President and a Senate that literally ignore the law and say they're not going to produce a budget. They're not going to produce a budget that balances. They're not going to produce a budget that sets priorities. They're just going to keep borrowing money from China and sending the bill to our kids and our grandkids. And then the President wants to come and demand that Congress give him another credit card.

We absolutely have to pay off the debts of the past. But when the President says not only pay those debts off, but give him another credit card so he can keep spending money, but he doesn't even lay out a plan of how he's going to spend the money—and, oh, by the way, whatever he produces never ever balances.

Is it too much just to ask the President when is your budget going to finally get to balance? If it's not next year, if it's not 10 years from now, if it's not 20 years from now, at least put that transparency out there in public.

He said he was going to be the most transparent President ever, and yet, when it comes time to actually deliver, to produce and to show something to the American people, he always wants to blame somebody else.

We've got to stop living crisis to crisis, and one of the ways you stop this crisis of the moment is to finally produce a plan, lay something out. Let's debate it. We can have disagreements over it, but you have to start with a plan, and that's what this bill does. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 21 minutes remaining. The

gentleman from Maryland has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), a new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Chairman, we've heard the criticism, this is a game. Well, any family that has found themselves in a financial crisis knows this is not a game. I'm one of those families.

Eighteen years ago, I lost my job in a corporate merger. After 48 hours of depression, my wife and I woke up, made a pot of coffee, drew a line down the middle of the page, and on one side we wrote down, this is what we have coming in, on the other side we wrote down, this is how we're going to spend it.

In an economy when far too many of our friends and family members are out of work, there's no question in my mind that while we're debating this, there are families that are going through that exact exercise. Those families that are making those tough decisions in their family budgets have every reason to expect their policymakers to do the same.

We shed tears around the kitchen table that morning. Those families are shedding tears around the kitchen table right now. They know that's not a game. They expect Washington to come up with a budget, and that's what this bill does.

This bill says, Mr. President, give us a budget. Show us when it balances. Tell us when you have a balanced budget. We ask the President to do the same thing that American families are doing.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), a new Member of the House.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, and commend my colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, for his hard work on this issue.

I've been surprised by some of the testimony on the other side of the aisle today. This bill says one very simple thing, that the President, when he submits a budget, must say when or whether it balances. The American people deserve to know when the budget proposed by the President will budget. That's all this bill requires.

It doesn't say the President has to balance the budget, though he should. It doesn't say he needs to stop sending money we don't have, though we must. It just asks him to tell the American people, when, if at all, the budget proposal will not be in deficit.

This should not be a partisan issue. Past Presidents should have submitted balanced budgets. Our current President should submit a balanced budget. Future Presidents should do the same.

The Require a PLAN Act is a straightforward, commonsense step in

the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Require a PLAN Act. Each year, law requires the President to submit a budget by the first Monday in February. Yesterday President Obama missed this deadline for the fourth time in 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the American people know what it's like to work through tough times and to live on a budget. When my wife and I started our small business, we made only \$50 the first month. We worked hard and made sacrifices to live within our means. Families across this great Nation are still doing that, and it's embarrassing that the President and Senate Democrats refuse to put forth a plan.

Republicans have produced a budget that made tough choices but reduces our debt and achieves fiscal responsibility. The Require a PLAN Act demands that the President explain to the American people how he intends to do the same. The great people of our Nation deserve at least that.

□ 1520

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his exceptional work on this particular act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the PLAN Act. For the past few years, our government has been operating off of stopgap measures that have led to frequent partisan debates and negotiations, threatening government shutdowns, and withholding pay from our men and women in uniform. At a time when our country is more than \$16 trillion in debt, all of which is saddled on our children and grandchildren, we must act on the years upon years of rampant, runaway Federal spending that has occurred under both political parties. To be effective, we must create a plan for how we spend the hard-earned taxpayers' dollars. That plan is a budget—a budget that needs to balance over time.

The House has passed legislation each year that would work to balance our budget. Since the Senate will not take up our legislation that the country and the people of Florida so desperately need, we are calling upon the President to do his job: to propose a solution that will balance our budget throughout the next 10 years.

The Senate has not passed a budget in nearly 4 years. On Monday, this President, for the fourth time, missed his legally obligated deadline for filing his budget request. We're requiring the Senate and the President to show some

leadership by submitting a budget plan to preserve America's future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire, as I understand, we're doing half of the total time tomorrow. Would the chairman know how much time remains today on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has a maximum of 16½ minutes. The gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes. The Chair cannot enforce informal agreements, and it is up to the gentlemen how much time they wish to consume today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we're each going to take 15 minutes' time, which would allow the gentleman 1½ minutes, and our side will take 1 minute. And I have no more speakers, other than myself to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That's my understanding, too.

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a couple comments which are 100 percent accurate, just so people watching this can understand what we're all talking about, since there's a lot of confusion. The President is going to submit a budget. He has submitted a budget every year of his 4 years. Our Republican colleagues don't like the budgets that he submits, but they're free to look at them. They're transparent. They're on the Internet. The President was late this year because we worked frantically to avoid the fiscal cliff and reach an agreement on January 2. You need to know what your revenues are going to be before you can put together a budget, number one.

Number two, the House can take whatever action it wants on the President's budget. You can tell the people you don't like it and you can have your own alternative, as you will. But he's going to submit a budget that's transparent, which is why we shouldn't be wasting time talking about this on the floor of the House when in less than 1 month we're going to see these across-the-board meat-ax cuts take place that our Republican colleagues themselves have acknowledged are going to hurt jobs and hurt the economy, which is why we proposed an alternative, a substitute to prevent those meat-ax cuts from taking place. And, unfortunately, our colleagues who keep saying they want an open and transparent process, put the gavel down and said, no, that this House of Representatives isn't going to have a chance to vote on something to prevent the across-the-board sequester cuts. Instead, they just want to keep on whistling by this problem. They haven't taken it up in this Congress.

So I urge my colleagues to get serious, come back with a plan like ours and that will demonstrate, Mr. Chairman, that we're serious.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is what it's about. This is the debt of our country right down here. The red path is where we're headed under this President's proposals. The red path results in extreme hardship to all Americans, but especially those at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

We believe that it's extremely important for the Nation to know that the positive, principled, fair, caring solutions that the Republicans put forward to save, strengthen, and secure the programs are in contrast to a specific proposal from the other side. And to date, we haven't seen that proposal. We've seen a lot of speeches. We've heard a lot of wonderful words. But the American people need to know when the President's budget balances. And this bill simply says, Mr. President, tell us when your budget balances. Very common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONGRATULATING DAN FISHER ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Dan Fisher, the superintendent for the Bald Eagle School District in Centre County, Pennsylvania, on his upcoming retirement and for his 40 years of education service. Dan Fisher began his education career at Bald Eagle Area School District as a teacher in 1973. I had the privilege of having Mr. Fisher as a teacher, where I first learned the workings of government in a constitutional Republic. Dan later went on to become the assistant principal in 1982, the assistant superintendent in 1985, and the district superintendent in 1989, where he served for 23 years.

I have had the honor of serving on the Bald Eagle Area School Board with Mr. Fisher's leadership as superintendent. Dan has been a visionary for education and improving educational