

the list of included crops under the Non-insured Crop Assistance Program. (Section 12205)

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision. (Section 12305)

(38) Pima Cotton Trust Fund

The Senate amendment establishes a trust fund in the Treasury, funded through appropriations, for the Secretary to make payments to nationally recognized associations that promote pima cotton use, yarn spinners who produced ring spun cotton from January 1, 1998 to December 21, 2003, and manufacturers who cut and sew cotton shirts and used imported cotton fabric from January 1, 1998 through July 1, 2003. Payments to spinners and manufacturers are based on a production ratio and must be certified through affidavit. (Section 12210)

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment. The amendment alters the funding mechanism for the Trust Fund to use funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Section 12314)

(39) Agricultural Wool Apparel Manufacturers Trust Fund

The Senate amendment establishes a trust fund in the Treasury, funded through appropriations, for the Secretary to make payments to eligible manufacturers under paragraphs (3) and (6) of section 4002(c) of the Wool Suit and Textile Trade Extension Act of 2004. Payments are to be made to eligible manufacturers for years 2010–2013, no later than 30 days after funds are transferred to the trust fund. For years 2014–2019, payments are to be made no later than April 15 of the year of payment. (Section 12211)

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment. The amendment alters the funding mechanism for the Trust Fund to use funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Section 12315)

(40) Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund

The Senate amendment establishes a trust fund in the Treasury, funded through appropriations, for the Secretary to make payments to entities engaged in 1) scientific research on diseases and pests; 2) the dissemination and commercialization of relevant information, techniques, or technology to solve citrus production disease or pest problems; and 3) the Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund Advisory Board, if established. The Citrus Advisory Board would have five members from Florida, three from Arizona or California, and one from Texas. Not more than 5 percent of the Citrus Trust Fund may be used for the operations of the advisory board. The Secretary shall give strong deference to funding research projects on the proximity of citrus producers and the effects of such diseases as huanglongbing (citrus greening). (Section 12212)

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute amends and moves this provision to Title VII. (Sections 7103 & 7306)

SUBTITLE D—CHESAPEAKE BAY
ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY

(41) Chesapeake Bay Accountability Act of 2013

The House bill requires the Director of OMB to submit to Congress a crosscut budget on federal and state restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay. It requires the Ad-

ministrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop a plan to provide assistance to Chesapeake Bay States to employ adaptive management in carrying out restoration activities. The Administrator shall update the plan every two years and report annually to Congress on the implementation of the plan. The amendment also requires the Administrator to appoint an Independent Evaluator to review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. (Section 12401)

The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

The Managers continue to support the efforts of farmers in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff. The Managers made significant investments in Title II programs aimed at providing financial and technical assistance to producers within the watershed. The Managers note the newly-created Regional Conservation Partnership Program which will provide USDA additional authorities to promote conservation practices within the watershed.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND
SENATE REGARDING EARMARKS AND
CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTED SPENDING
ITEMS

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, neither this conference report nor the accompanying joint statement of managers contains any congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in such rules.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

FRANK D. LUCAS,
RANDY NEUGEBAUER,
MIKE ROGERS of Alabama,
MICHAEL K. CONAWAY,
GLENN THOMPSON of
Pennsylvania,
AUSTIN SCOTT,
ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD,
MARTHA ROBY,
KRISTI L. NOEM,
JEFF DENHAM,
RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois,
COLLIN C. PETERSON,
MIKE MCINTYRE,
JIM COSTA,
TIMOTHY J. WALZ,
KURT SCHRADER,
SUZAN K. DELBENE,
GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD,
FILEMON VELA,

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House amendment, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
TOM MARINO,
ELIOT L. ENGEL,

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of secs. 1207 and 1301 of the House amendment, and secs. 1301, 1412, 1435, and 4204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

DAVE CAMP,
SAM JOHNSON of Texas,

For consideration of the House amendment and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

STEVE SOUTHERLAND, II,
MARCIA L. FUDGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DEBBIE STABENOW,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
TOM HARKIN,
MAX BAUCUS,
SHERROD BROWN,
AMY KLOBUCHAR,
MICHAEL F. BENNET,
THAD COCHRAN,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
JOHN BOOZMAN,
JOHN HOEVEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SNAP CUTS IN THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 30 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. First, let me say thank you to my colleagues who are leaving the floor for your great work on the issue of wage stagnation and the inability for upward mobility for people in this Nation. You have done a great service here tonight with laying out what the facts are. What we need to do is to be able to increase people's income and, therefore, give them the economic wherewithal to take care of themselves and their families and have a road to economic security. So I thank you very, very much.

I also want to say a thank you to my colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman CICILLINE, who will join me in this 30-minute Special Order for tonight.

Tonight, I want to talk about the severe and immoral cuts being made to anti-hunger and nutrition programs, and particularly the continuation of devastating food stamp cuts being made in the proposed conference farm bill. We have said here that food stamps—food stamps—are an economic safety net.

As written, the farm bill would force 850,000 households—1.7 million men, women, children and veterans across America—to go hungry, even while wealthy agri-businesses continue to get generous crop subsidies. Low-income seniors, working poor families with children, and individuals with disabilities would be particularly impacted by the cruel cuts in this bill.

Meanwhile, the conference has decided to reopen the loopholes that the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, closed; and those loopholes as they reopen them will make sure that millionaires and billionaires are getting crop subsidies. One has to ask the question, Who are we working for here? In effect, this is reverse Robin Hood legislation. It steals food from the poor to help pay crop subsidies to the rich. And when I see Members supporting the immoral cuts in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I have to wonder if some people in this institution have really lost their perspective and understand why we are here and what our moral responsibility is.

Across this country—this great country—nearly 50 million Americans, including over 16 million children, are

struggling with hunger right now. Think for a moment about what that means. In 1974, a writer at *Time* magazine explained it this way:

The victim of starvation burns up his own body fats, muscles and tissues for fuel. His body quite literally consumes itself and deteriorates rapidly. The kidneys, liver and endocrine system often cease to function properly. A shortage of carbohydrates, which play a vital role in brain chemistry, affects the mind. Lassitude and confusion set in, so that starvation victims often seem unaware of their plight.

That is what we are talking about here. Hunger is agonizing. It is a curse. We are talking about men and women experiencing real physical torment, children who cannot concentrate in school because all they can think about is food. Seniors are forced to decide, in this virulent winter season, this polar vortex that we talked about, whether or not they will go hungry or whether or not they will go cold.

This is a problem all across this land. The estimates of Americans at risk of going hungry, here in the land of plenty, are appalling. In my Connecticut district, nearly one in seven households is not sure if they can afford enough food to feed their families. In Mississippi, 24.5 percent suffer food hardship. That is nearly one in four people. In West Virginia and Kentucky, 22 percent, one in five people, suffer food hardship; in Ohio, nearly 20 percent; and in California, just over 19 percent.

The continued existence of hunger in America is a disgrace and, quite frankly, an indictment of this institution. As the late Senator George McGovern, a champion against hunger, wrote:

The Earth has enough knowledge and resources to eradicate this ancient scourge. Hunger has plagued the world for thousands of years. But ending it is a great moral imperative now more than ever before, because for the first time humanity has the instruments at hand to defeat this cruel enemy at a very reasonable cost. We have the ability to provide food for all within the next three decades.

□ 2030

Or as President John F. Kennedy put it:

We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the Earth. We need only the will.

Mr. Speaker, that will seems to be lacking in the Congress right now. Instead of working to end hunger for good, this farm bill takes food from the plates of 1.7 million Americans. And again, we are talking about seniors, veterans, children, families who are playing by the rules and many of whom are working full-time, all the time.

The farm bill, this one that is being proposed, would force Americans to go hungry. And at the same time, the conference has chosen, against the will of the House and the Senate, to reopen loopholes and strip out payment limits so that millionaires and wealthy agribusinesses can continue to get handouts.

It is unconscionable what has happened here. On its own cognizance, and

in violation of the congressional rule that provisions passed by both bodies should not be changed, the conference more than doubled the annual dollars on primary payments. They said you now get \$50,000 for a primary payment for your commodities, we are now going to raise that to \$125,000. That loophole was closed. They then reopened the loophole closed in the House and the Senate that allows large wealthy farmers to collect far, far more than that nominal payment limit. And they did this while they cut \$8.5 billion from food stamps.

What is interesting, what is very interesting and cruel, if you will, is that those folks who are upper-income scale, the wealthiest of farmers, they don't have to have any income threshold or test to see how much they make before they qualify for these payments. They don't have to tell us about what assets they have before they qualify for these payments. We don't have a cap on the payments that we give them. These are millionaires. And yes, for food stamp recipients, we have an asset threshold, an income threshold. We say, if you make so much money, you are not eligible for \$1.40 per meal. You are not eligible. But if you are a millionaire, all bets are off. All bets are off. And you know those folks at the top rung, they are eating well. They are getting three squares a day. They are feeding their kids. And what we are going to do is to take food away from food stamp recipients—men, women, seniors, children, and veterans.

Where are the values of this great Nation? We have lost our way. We have lost our way.

In the past, there has been a strong tradition of bipartisanship on fighting hunger and supporting nutrition, from the left, leaders like George McGovern, and from the right, leaders like Bob Dole who would come together to make a difference for families in need. In fact, Senator Dole called the egregious cuts to food stamps in the House version of the bill "an about-face on our progress fighting hunger." This is because food stamps is our country's most important effort to deal with hunger here at home and to ensure that American families can put food on the table for their kids. They help over 47 million Americans, nearly half of them children, meet their basic food needs, and they make a tremendous difference for the health and well-being of families. Food stamps have been proven to improve low-income children's health and development, reduce food insecurity, and have a continuing positive influence into adulthood.

Children's Health Watch researchers found, after collecting 14 years' worth of data on over 20,000 low-income families, that when families experience a loss or reduction in food stamp benefits, they are more likely to be food insecure, be in poor health, and their children experience intensified developmental delays relative to their peers.

Food stamps also have one of the lowest error rates of any government

program. It is around 3.8 percent. That includes overpayments and underpayments. I defy to go to any other agency—let's look at the crop insurance program and find out what their error rate is all about.

Food stamps are good for the economy, a positive impact on growth, because food stamps not only help to feed the hungry, they get resources into the hands of families who will spend them right away. The U.S. Department of Agriculture research shows that every \$5 of Federal food stamp benefits generates nearly twice that in economic activity.

Most importantly, of course, they are the right thing to do. Ninety-nine percent of food stamp recipients have incomes below the poverty line. It is the job of good government to help vulnerable families get back on their feet. In the words of Harry Truman:

Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare.

That is why, when he declared that "the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America," Richard Nixon called for a significant expansion of the food stamp program to "provide poor families enough food stamps to purchase a nutritionally complete diet."

This is something we all used to agree on. But now we are seeing a farm bill that cuts deeply into food stamps, and I ask again, how can anyone possibly support this?

Keep in mind, food stamps have already seen deep and dangerous cuts. If you look at the fridge in the picture that I am holding up, this represents where we should be in terms of access to food. But because of the recent expiration of the Recovery Act provisions, food stamps have already been cut by \$5 billion next year, and they will be cut by \$11 billion over the next 3 years.

On November 1, 2013, SNAP benefits were reduced, about \$36 less for a family of four each month. This means that a family of four loses \$36, or 16 meals a month, in support. That is the difference between health and hunger.

Now this Congress wants to enact another \$8.5 billion in cuts, meaning an additional \$90 per month, and that much more food taken away from 850,000 households. This is the proposed farm bill. SNAP cuts would result in 850,000 households, 1.7 million people, losing almost \$90 a month in monthly benefits.

And already, for far too many Americans, the last few weeks of the month, this is what their fridge looks like. Why would we put any more hardship on the most vulnerable families in our Nation, families who are already battling food insecurity and hunger? They will have an empty refrigerator. No one should go hungry due to food stamp cuts.

However you cut it, this is a terrible policy. Cutting food stamps will cause more hunger and health problems. These cuts are a dereliction of our responsibility as Members of Congress

and our moral responsibility to help the least fortunate among us.

As the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops has said:

We must form a “circle of protection” around programs that serve the poor and vulnerable in our Nation and throughout the world.

Or in the words of Pope Francis:

The scandal that millions of people suffer from hunger must not paralyze us, but push each and every one of us to act—singles, families, communities, institutions, governments—to eliminate this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, this farm bill takes us in the wrong direction. Instead of helping to end hunger, it cuts food stamps by \$90 a month for 1.7 million people. It forces poor families to choose between food on the table or warmth, and it does all of this while preserving loopholes and maximizing handouts for wealthy farmers and agribusinesses. We have to do better.

I hope all of my colleagues in both parties will stand up against the outrageously misplaced priorities in this farm bill. I hope we can rekindle the strong bipartisan support that existed for decades for ending hunger in America.

The astronaut Buzz Aldrin once said, “If we can conquer space, we can conquer childhood hunger,” and we can. This institution has the power. It has the potential to make that transformative change. We have the ability. We have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger in America. We only need the will to do what is right.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague from Rhode Island, who is such a strong supporter of families in this Nation and who has seen the ravages of families who have lost their unemployment benefits; and now what we intend to do is not only have they lost their unemployment benefits, we want to make sure, with this farm bill, what it would mean is that they are hungry and that they are cold. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for being here tonight.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for her extraordinary work and for her incredible passion on this very, very important issue and for giving me an opportunity to speak on this serious issue tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut has been a great champion for policies that fight hunger and protect a crucial safety net for our Nation's most vulnerable children and families. I am very proud to stand with her tonight against these devastating cuts to the SNAP program. You don't end hunger by cutting nutrition programs; you make it worse.

We should be working together to find ways to end hunger in America. We can do that. This is the greatest country on Earth. We should be certain that no man, woman, or child in this country goes hungry.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues filed the farm bill conference

report that would be absolutely devastating to families struggling to get by. For just a moment, I would like to walk through some of the cuts being proposed.

In States like mine with cold winters, many working families already struggling to buy food face the additional burden of expensive monthly utility bills to heat their homes. Faced with this reality, some parents are forced to decide what is more important for their child: a good, nutritious meal or a warm home. For decades now, the SNAP program has worked to provide additional benefits to struggling families facing both food insecurity and high heating or housing costs.

For example, in my home State of Rhode Island, individuals who receive even nominal assistance through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP, are also eligible for additional assistance under SNAP. This policy, often called Heat and Eat, makes sense for two reasons. First, this kind of policy helps prevent some of our most vulnerable families from having to face the difficult choice between a warm home and a good meal. Let's not forget, these families are living in the worst kind of poverty, the poorest and most needy members of our community, and they very often face the real threat of hunger and a freezing home.

The second reason this program is important is because it makes both programs more efficient and streamlines the application process. Without this policy, the same family would be forced to navigate a maze of bureaucracies to access resources in a time of tremendous need. Instead, under this policy, struggling families can access critical resources more easily and focus on the things that matter, like getting back on their feet or finding work. In a time of limited Federal resources for the poor, Heat and Eat helps. It helps States coordinate assistance programs and leverages funding from SNAP and LIHEAP so no family is faced with that impossible choice.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have called this a loophole, but it is not a loophole. This is a policy, an effective policy, designed to address a real problem for families facing especially hard times. The conference report that was filed tonight cuts and undermines States' efforts to coordinate food and heating assistance, and it will make the lives of our neediest families even more difficult.

I know many of my colleagues will think that this is an easy pill to swallow. Why? Because it places the burden of further reductions to nutrition problems on the backs of a smaller group of individuals in a limited number of States. Only 16 States administer Heat and Eat programs, primarily cold weather States like Rhode Island and Connecticut, and it is a cruel twist that my colleagues have decided to target cold weather States right after many parts of the country faced

record-breaking cold and incredibly high heating costs.

□ 2045

According to the previous estimates of this policy, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said that about 850,000 households would see their benefits cut by an average of about \$90 a month. Of course, many of the households affected by this cut will be low-income seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, children, and the working poor. In total, this cut impacts 1.7 million people struggling to put food on the table, and it imposes all of these cuts on only those families living in 16 States.

The same people that are proposing these cuts in nutrition programs are more than happy to provide agricultural companies with extremely generous subsidies to purchase crop insurance. They are happy to spend \$40 billion over the next 10 years in commodity programs. They are happy to undermine payment reform, like limits on total commodity payments for personnel, reforms that were approved and voted on by the full House last June and that could result in even higher subsidies for the wealthiest farmers.

In fact, one of the architects of this bill has tried to make the case for maintaining certain agricultural subsidies by saying, “The safety net still has to exist.” Apparently, to protect the safety net, the wealthiest farmers, children, and families in 16 States will be forced to struggle even harder to put food on the table. It is a sad day in this country when the safety net for wealthy farmers is more important than the safety net for hungry families.

I thank the gentlelady for all of the work that she has done and for the information she just shared about how effective and important this program is.

I just want to end with two quotes from important religious groups who have spoken to this issue that I hope my colleagues will hear and rethink this decision and reject this proposal and speak to our values as a country.

The National Association of Evangelicals said:

As you determine the policies and appropriations for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, please maintain this vital program at or near its current level of funding, and refrain from enacting policies that could damage our most vulnerable citizens.

And a U.S. Catholic bishop said:

How the House chooses to address our Nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have profound human and moral consequences.

I hope we will all hear those words and do what is right for families, will speak to our values as a country and protect those most in need from any additional cuts that will adversely impact their families and their ability to feed themselves.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. DELAURO. I can't thank the gentleman enough for your eloquence and

what clarity you brought to the discussion around the connection between the low-income energy assistance program and the food stamp program and taking it out of the realm of what people are trying to do, which is to de-mean it and talk about it as a scheme or a loophole, none of which is true. We can talk about some schemes and some loopholes in this bill, but they don't apply where it has to do with the food stamp beneficiaries.

I want to pick up on a point that you made about the safety net. The farm bill—and I had the opportunity to work in 2008 on the farm bill, and particularly the nutrition piece—has always been a safety net for farmers and for those who are the beneficiaries of the nutrition programs. That is the link that was established, so that the benefits would go nationwide, not to a particular region of the country, not to a particular population, but a safety net so that we could make sure that people in bad times, in difficult times, could be able to sustain themselves. That is what has been broken apart here with this farm bill.

The point is that where the farm bill conferees will say that they are cutting back on these payments to farmers, what they have done is to create a series of other programs where these folks can make themselves whole through crop insurance, through putting more farm managers on the land and no restrictions as to how many you can put at \$125,000 a pop. So they found ways in terms of which they make these folks whole.

The only beneficiaries in the farm bill who have no place to go when you cut back on that \$90 a month are the food stamp recipients. So you have yanked the safety net away from them and you have done it to benefit the wealthiest farm interests in the Nation. It is wrong.

That bipartisan support we had in the past for a safety net is what created strength. I am sad to tell you that that has been rent asunder, and we cannot let that happen.

I am going to encourage my colleagues—and I know you will—that we will defeat this effort to leave people without sustenance in this Nation.

I thank the gentleman for participating tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2223

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-334) on the resolution (H. Res. 465) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of surgical recovery.

Mr. TIPTON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delay.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Mr. Speaker, section 111 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law No: 113-67, which established a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014, requires the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees to submit for printing in the Congressional Record committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2014.

Pursuant to section 111 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I hereby submit for print-

ing in the Congressional Record: (1) an allocation for fiscal year 2014 for the House Committee on Appropriations, (2) allocations for fiscal years 2014 and 2014 through 2023 for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, (3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2014, and (4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2014 and 2014 through 2023.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the revenue aggregates, the levels shall be set consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's May 2013 baseline, adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and other legislation enacted since the release of the May 2013 baseline. In other words, in these instances, the new allocations and levels are set equal to the updated May baseline.

Associated tables are attached. These committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels 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 committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, at 202-226-7270.

Sincerely,
PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,
CHAIRMAN,
House Budget Committee

Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Totals

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—	
	2014	2014–2023
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,924,837	(1)
Outlays	2,937,044	(1)
Revenues	2,311,026	31,095,742

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Allocation of Spending Authority to the House Committee on Appropriations
(in millions of dollars)

2014		
Base Discretionary Action:	BA	1,012,237
	OT	1,154,816
Global War on Terrorism:	BA	91,938
	OT	45,207
Disaster Designated Funds:	BA	5,626
	OT	281
Program Integrity:	BA	924
	OT	832
Total Discretionary:	BA	1,110,725
	OT	1,201,136
Current Law Mandatory:	BA	749,400
	OT	738,140

Spending Authority for House Authorizing Committees

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

		2014	2014–2023
Agriculture:			
May 2013 Base-	BA	92,956	906,903
line.			
OT		89,341	900,800
Adjustment for	BA	–59	–770
Enacted Legis-			
lation.			
OT		–59	–770
Total	BA	92,897	906,133
	OT	89,282	900,030
Armed Services:			
May 2013 Base-	BA	150,138	1,764,863
line.			
OT		149,922	1,768,772