

\$46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$8,713,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$92,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Acting 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. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON.
RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL
YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 29, 2015, at page H2516.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking everyone involved in getting us to this moment, where we have an agreement between the House and the Senate Budget conferees on a joint balanced budget proposal before the Congress.

All members of our committee and the conference committee and their

staffs should be commended for their hard work. And I want to commend specifically the staff directors on both sides of the aisle. Rick May on the Republican side and Tom Kahn on the Democratic side worked yeoman's service in making certain that their respective Members were prepared for the activity that we have gone through over the past 4 months.

We are set, Mr. Speaker, to adopt the first balanced budget of this kind in over a decade. That is important not only from an historical perspective but also for what it says about this Congress' commitment to doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, to get it done, to move forward with positive solutions for a healthier economy and a stronger, more secure nation.

□ 1615

What we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a budget that balances within 10 years without raising taxes and reduces spending over \$5 trillion over that period of time, which will not only get Washington's fiscal house in order, but pave the way for stronger economic growth, more jobs, and more opportunity.

It invests in our Nation's priorities, ensures a strong national defense, and saves, strengthens, and protects important programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know our friends on the other side of the aisle, we will hear from them, and they may have a difference of opinion. If past is prologue, we are bound to hear from them a few items that they will talk about. They will say that our budget will, in their words, "hurt the middle class." That statement bears no resemblance to reality, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, what is hurting the middle class right now are the policies of our Democrat friends and President Obama that they have put in place, policies that have led to the worst economic recovery in the modern era, stagnant wages and underwhelming growth in our economy. We just heard today, Mr. Speaker, that the economy grew in the first quarter by 0.2 percent. There is a reason for that.

What we need to do is to get the economy rolling. The best thing we can do for the middle class—for hard-working American families—is to get our economy turned around so more jobs are being created and more dreams are being realized.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Our budget does just that through responsible reforms that make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable by lifting the oppressive regulatory regime here in Washington off the backs of job creators and entrepreneurs and by fundamentally reforming our Tax Code so it is simpler, fairer, and American companies can better compete more effectively in the global economy.

By doing all of that, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office tells us

that we will rein in deficits and lower government spending which will have a positive, long-term impact on the economy as well as the budget, benefits like increases in the pool of national savings and investment which would allow for more growth, job creation, and more economic security.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of attacking our efforts to save, strengthen, and protect programs like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Why some folks here in Washington would be willing to let these programs go bankrupt is beyond me. Medicare and Social Security are going broke. That is not according to me. That is according to the trustees of the programs.

Medicaid is not working for patients or the doctors who would like to be able to serve them. The status quo is unsustainable, and doing nothing is indefensible. We can save these programs and improve them. We have to do so for the sake of their beneficiaries and for future generations, and our budget does just that.

Further, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, our budget prioritizes the safety and security of the American people, channeling important resources to our men and women in uniform. We do so in a responsible way, in a manner consistent with current law, and without allowing further across-the-board cuts in defense spending.

There are those who criticize how we do that, and I respect that there are differences of opinion on this, but, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can all agree that, when we are faced with hugely complex national security threats and growing unrest around the world, what we need to do is to find a way to move forward to ensure that those protecting our lives and our freedom have the support and the training that they need.

I look forward to an open and honest debate about the vision we have put forward to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, to strengthen our Nation's defenses, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, and to ensure a healthier economy for all Americans because that is exactly what this budget agreement does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to this budget conference report.

I do agree with the gentleman on one issue, which is that the staff of the Budget Committee on both sides, Republican and Democrat, have worked very hard; but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the product that is brought before us today is the wrong direction for America.

We began with a House budget that was wrong for America, and we went to conference with a Senate budget that was wrong for America. It is not surprising, but it is still disappointing,

that we come to the floor today with a budget that is wrong for America.

Why do I say that? We are all entitled to our opinions, but we don't get to make up our own facts. The reality is, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the folks who are referees in this House, in this Congress, where people have competing opinions, they have said that this Republican budget will slow down the economy over the next couple of years.

It is right here on page 3 of their report. Real GNP, real economic growth per person, would be lowered by as much as 0.6 percent under the specified paths than under the baseline 2016 to 2018 CBO budget estimates.

Let's translate that. What that means is that, compared to what would happen in the economy without the Republican budget—if we didn't have this—this will make things worse. This will slow down economic growth. This means less economic growth per person in the United States of America. That is not me saying it, that is the nonpartisan budget experts saying it. So it is going to slow down economic growth, although we have good news, some good news in the economy, right. I mean, we have seen month after month now of positive economic growth. We would like to see the economy grow faster, and we would like to see it grow stronger, but we have seen over 61 consecutive months of positive economic growth. Why in the world would we want a budget that over the next couple of years slows down that economic growth, according to the Congressional Budget Office?

But it gets worse than that because one of the chronic problems we have seen in our economy, Mr. Speaker, over the last many years—not just 2 or 3 or 4, but over decades—is this phenomenon where Americans are working harder than ever and they are more productive than ever, but their paychecks are flat. Their take-home pay is flat.

You have rising worker productivity on the one hand; people are working harder than ever, but it is not translating into higher wages and benefits.

Back about 30 or 40 years ago—we had a chart with rising worker productivity—guess what else was rising with it? It was worker wages. But, over the last 30 years, we have seen people working harder than ever, and productivity has gone up, but wages for most Americans have been pretty flat in real terms.

The gain of that increased worker productivity has flowed dramatically and overwhelmingly to folks at the very top end of the economic ladder, and God bless them. But why would we want to bring a budget to the floor of the House that squeezes even tighter and harder the people who are working hard every day and not seeing their paychecks go up?

How does their budget make life harder for most Americans? First of all, Mr. Speaker, it increases taxes on

working families. They get rid of the bump up in the Child Tax Credit. They get rid of the strengthening of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

They eliminate entirely the college deduction that helps families afford college in this era of high tuition rates; they get rid of that. They eliminate the Affordable Care Act tax credits, meaning millions of Americans will no longer be able to access affordable care.

Students, they actually start charging students higher interest rates on their loans. Right now, a student in college doesn't have to pay interest on their loan while they are in college. Our Republican colleagues apparently think that \$1 trillion of student debt is not enough. They want to charge them more. It is a fact under this budget.

Seniors, they want to reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. It is not a secret. They have said they will do this. As a result, seniors with high prescription drug costs on Medicare will be paying lots more, and they will be paying higher copays for preventative health care under this Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, working families, students, and seniors are all squeezed even tighter.

I will tell you who is not squeezed at all under this budget, the folks at the very top. This budget green-lights the Romney-Ryan tax plan. What does that plan propose? Let's cut the top tax rate for millionaires by one-third—by one-third. Let's take it down from 39 percent to the 28, 25 percent range. That is who gets a big break in their tax rates.

While they are cutting tax rates for folks at the very top, what else are they cutting? They are cutting our investment in our kids' education. They are cutting our investment in science and research at places like NIH. They are cutting our investment in modernizing our infrastructure which has helped power our economy.

Why? It is because they are cutting the portion of the budget we use to make those investments by 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the 1950s. That is a disinvestment in America, so they are cutting those investments.

I will tell you what they don't cut, Mr. Speaker. They don't cut one special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, not one penny. Apparently, that corporate jet tax deduction? Oh, they really need it. Apparently, that special tax rate for hedge fund managers? They really need it because they don't want to eliminate any of those in order to reduce the deficit. They do apparently want to increase taxes on working families and cut our investment in education.

Here is the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker. After all that, it still doesn't balance, not by a long shot. Here is the chart. I'm sorry we have to go through this math so many times, but I will tell you that the current chairman of the

Senate Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, before he became chairman, talked about this budget accounting scam that is at the heart of the Republican budget and at the heart of the claim that they have a balanced budget because, you see, they claim that, at the end of the 10-year window, they are \$33 billion in balance, but they also say they are eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

Guess what, the budget relies on the same level of revenue as the Affordable Care Act. If you get rid of the Affordable Care Act in those revenues, you are not close to balance.

I will tell you what else it doesn't take into account, the tax provisions. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had on this floor, just about 10 days ago, a Republican proposal to eliminate the estate tax for estates over \$10 million.

That was the overwhelming economic priority of our Republican colleagues, to get rid of the estate tax for estates over \$10 million, about 5,500 people in this country per year. You can put more people on a big cruise ship. That added about \$260 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Guess what, it wasn't accounted for in the Republican budget. If you did account for that in the other tax cut measures for special interests that are being brought to the floor, it is even further out of balance, so this is just Alice in Wonderland accounting.

Mr. Speaker, we really should be going back to the drawing board. We haven't even talked about the whole sort of shell game being played with the OCO account, which is already having an impact on appropriations bills here in the House because our Republican colleagues are doing this year the exact opposite of what they said we should do just last year. Read the Republican's own budget conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with respect to veterans because the reality is that the first bill coming to the floor based on this budget conference report for veterans and military construction, the Veterans of Foreign Wars says it is bad for veterans.

It has a lower amount for our veterans than in the President's proposal. We believe we should be true to the values and priorities of this country, and we don't think that means giving folks at the very top, millionaires, another cut in their tax rate while disinvesting in the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose this Republican conference committee report because it really does take America down the wrong path, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

□ 1630

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman PRICE for his

extraordinary leadership throughout this entire process. And I want to thank my fellow conferees for their hard work, many hours over many days, to get us to where we are today and, of course, my fellow Budget Committee members, both Republican and Democrat, for the robust discussion, debate, spirit, as it was sometimes. The process worked. We did go late into the night a few times. But we came out of those late nights, those long hours, with the product here today.

The product here today, unfortunately, is a more rare product than it should be. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 2001, 14 years, we have a balanced joint budget resolution, bicameral.

As a relatively new person to this Chamber, in my fifth year, and you think about why that is the case, you, unfortunately, in my opinion, have to conclude it is because most of the time we are talking about the demagoguery, like some of which we just heard, half the story, so to speak, about what is really going on here. If we had full discussions about where this country really needs to go, where this Federal Government needs to go in terms of improving its debt and deficit picture, the whole budget picture, you would really see that the economy in this country could be better off with those honest, full discussions.

This budget, for example, does balance in less than 10 years without raising taxes—without raising taxes. The gentleman very much knows that the Budget Committee doesn't write tax prescriptions; it is the Ways and Means Committee. We say in our budget document that the Ways and Means Committee should get on with the business of tax reform.

What the Congressional Budget Office that the gentleman mentioned says is that over the 10-year window of this budget agreement, the economy will grow \$400 billion. That is hardly a contraction. \$400 billion, at least to some of us, is a lot of money, and that is great for economic growth. This budget agreement does that.

Do you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by "the whole story"?

It also ensures a strong national defense, making sure that our troops have the money they need, but remain accountable to the money that is given. It gives us a chance to repeal in full, taxes and all, ObamaCare, and allows us a chance to start over with patient-centered health reform. It hasn't been done. We haven't had that chance in a long time. ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, is an expensive proposition, and we are seeing more and more proof of that every day.

It strengthens Medicare in the future without affecting those in or near retirement now. This is important. Some of us, for my friends on the conservative side, have looked at the press reports and found, hey, we have given up on Medicare. Absolutely not; nor for Social Security.

These are the drivers of our debt, Mr. Speaker, and our budget language remains intact. The fact of the matter is this conference committee report is numerically driven, not policy driven.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROKITA. And for everyone, this is what is driving our debt. These pieces of the pie. They are all attached together, whether it is Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or the interest we owe ourselves and others for the amount of money we are borrowing.

Our ideas for correcting this debt, the drivers of our debt, are still in place. I call upon the authorizing committees, whether it be Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, or any other committee, to start working on reforming this debt.

This budget agreement, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity, finally, after 14 years, to start down that road. This is not a conclusion; this is a beginning, and I ask my Democratic friends to join us down that road.

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

I would actually encourage all those authorizing committees to get to work trying to implement this budget so the American people can see just how bad it is. I would be curious as to whether they are actually going to do it in the next couple of months.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I rise in strong opposition to this budget.

There is football and then there is fantasy football. Mr. Ranking Member, you were being very charitable when you used the word "scam." This is a real lemon by any stretch—and you don't have to use your imagination.

This is a formula for another 2007–2008. This will be a duplication. And the pain caused by that decade, that 8 years of the 21st century, the budgets from 2001–2008 when we cut taxes in 2001 and we cut taxes in 2003, and then 2007 and 2008 the world fell apart. Why? An enormous loss of jobs every month. Look at the numbers. You want to hold up charts, hold them up.

This agreement uses gimmicks to balance the budget and does so on the backs of the poor and the middle class and senior citizens. It imposes its cuts on programs that assist low- and middle-income Americans even though they constitute—those programs—less than one-fourth of the Federal spending.

The Republican plan would cause tens of millions of people to become uninsured or underinsured. I know how you are careful to even talk about that. In other words, if we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, make

sure you put in a sentence about what we need to do about those people who have preconditions.

Phony, phony, phony. You said it; we didn't.

Slashing funding for education, for research, for infrastructure. Wait until the bridges fall down and more people fall into the water. Cuts to nutrition, cuts to health will only increase poverty. Your claims that this budget balances is a total farce—not a semi-farce, a total farce.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN produced a very strong, fair budget. It was a strong budget. It was dismissed. But I like it. I like it. Through the Chair to my ranking member, I like it when we are seen as irrelevant. We do our best work.

So that is what you have got in front of you. This budget, while calling for a complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume the law's \$2 trillion revenue. That is not a farce. That is fantasy football. How could you do that? The bill stinks, but we will use the money in the bill. Explain that one.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. To me, when we get the taxes, this budget assumes that revenues remained unchanged from our current law. Someone needs to have a conversation with the chairman of Ways and Means, because he seems to be unaware. In fact, he stated explicitly that he doesn't think we should be using the current law baseline. He said it; I didn't.

Two weeks ago, this same majority—and I end on this point, Mr. Speaker—we passed \$294.8 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks for Paris Hilton and Ivanka Trump and the rest of that crowd and their fortune enough to be left a nice inheritance. Much of that money has never been taxed in the first place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members in the second person.

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

As I said when we talked about this the first time around, folks across this land, if they turn on the television and they take a look, you have got one parent yelling at the other: Hide the dog and the cat and the kids, sweetheart, they are talking about the budget.

The distortion and the misrepresentation that is coming from the other side, Mr. Speaker, it really is absolutely phenomenal.

I am pleased to hear that the gentleman likes their budget, and I commend him for liking their budget; but let me just state for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that neither their budget nor the President's budget ever, ever, ever gets to balance. If the American people can't live on borrowed money, their

Federal Government ought not do so either.

Our budget gets to balance within a 10-year period of time. It does so without raising taxes. That is why the American people are going to appreciate the work that is being done right here.

I am very, very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), an incredibly productive member of our committee, and a member of the conference committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a year makes. Since I came to Congress in 2011, my House Republican colleagues and I worked every year to pass a responsible, timely budget that confronts our runaway spending in Washington; but meanwhile, the Senate Democrats refused to pass a budget during 4 of the last 5 years. That ends now.

This year, our new American Congress worked to pass a balanced budget in both the House and the Senate and to then unify our budgets through regular order. I had the distinct privilege of serving on the budget conference committee, and I am pleased with the final product that we were able to deliver. This will mark the first balanced budget, joint budget resolution, since 2002, and we did it without raising taxes.

But we didn't stop there. This budget would also erase the President's disastrous healthcare law, allowing us to start over on reforms that put patients and their doctors in charge, not Washington bureaucrats. And we used the critical reconciliation tool to help ensure an ObamaCare repeal bill that reaches the President's desk so that we can put him on record, forcing him to make a decision and defend that to the American people.

What is more, this plan supports the growth of 1.2 million jobs over the next decade, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said many times before, budgets aren't just a series of numbers; they are a statement of our values. I believe the priorities found in this budget are shared by my constituents and reflect the values that we can all be proud of.

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

We keep hearing this mathematical fantasy that somehow the Republican budget balances.

I just want to turn to an authority. He is the now-chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here is what he said last year:

One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was an anticipation that ObamaCare would go away, and that all of that money would still be there, that's not realistic. I'd like to see us get to a real accounting with the budget.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker; the Affordable Care Act is still here, the

revenue is still here, and the Republican budget assumes that revenue for the purpose of achieving balance at the same time they are getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. That leaves people's heads spinning and it means the budget is not in balance.

I am now happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. VAN HOLLEN yielding.

We are talking a lot about gimmicks. Even the conservative Financial Times said the Republicans had to resort to smoke and mirrors to make this budget balance. But I want to talk about one of the other tricks that is used.

What the Republicans' budget uses is they do something called dynamic scoring, which basically allows you to project all sorts of, probably, at least, speculative growth based on policies that they would anticipate doing.

Now, here is a real-world example of that. This weekend is the Kentucky Derby. It would be as if somebody went out and said: I am going to buy a 2-year-old for \$2 million. And then that 2-year-old I am sure is going to win the Kentucky Derby, so I am going to use that \$3 million purse that that horse is certainly going to win next year, and I am going to plug that into my budget so my budget comes out ahead.

Yes, it could happen, but there is no evidence to believe it will happen. That is one of the ways that this budget reaches so-called balance.

There are other macroeconomic effects which we ought to consider, however. As we have mentioned several times, this budget would direct the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

The Deloitte professional services firm just did an audit of Kentucky's experience over the last 14 months, 15 months, with the Affordable Care Act. Here is what it said would happen in Kentucky over the next 6 years.

□ 1645

\$30 billion in increased economic activity, 44,000 new jobs, and a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of \$850 million—that is what would be eliminated from Kentucky. That is another effect of the Republican budget. Think about what it might do in other States—California, New York, Florida. For it to have that much impact in a State like Kentucky, the national effect would be very consequential.

Aside from all of the truly damaging ways in which this budget affects our economy and our citizens, we have to take note of the fact that there are impacts beyond just the Federal budget, and this budget would be a disaster for the American economy and the American people. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a productive and delightful member of our Budget Committee and a freshman member of our conference.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. I thank the chairman for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to say that, for the first time in many years, the House and Senate will adopt a unified resolution for a balanced budget. The 2016 Federal budget resolution will set the guardrails for Federal spending, and it is a step in the right direction for our country.

Families in my home State of Michigan and across the country tighten their belts when there is a change in household income or expenses, and Washington needs to do the same. The 2016 budget resolution does not raise taxes on hard-working Americans. It keeps the promises that have been made to seniors while slowing the soaring national debt. Leaving less debt to our children is vital, and if we fail to act, debt payments will crowd out spending for the priorities of the American people, including national security and protecting the Great Lakes.

This budget provides for flexibility, and it gives States the opportunity to innovate on Medicaid policy, allowing them to design a safety net that works best for those in need. This will move Medicaid further away from Washington bureaucrats and closer to the people it was meant to serve.

This budget also calls for tax reform, which has the potential to add 1 million new private sector jobs. The Tax Code is over 74,000 pages long and was last overhauled 29 years ago. It is time for a pro-growth Tax Code that is simpler and fairer.

This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, and it puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and colleague and the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Written by House and Senate Republicans alone, it reaffirms their commitment to a severe and unworkable policy agenda that would harm the economy and that stands little chance of being implemented.

This budget conference report draws heavily on the House Republicans' budget framework by eliminating the Medicare guarantee, turning Medicaid into a capped block grant, limiting Pell grants for college students, and cutting nutrition assistance while hiding \$1 trillion in additional cuts behind a magic asterisk to be filled in at some time in the future.

These proposals, if implemented, would be disastrous for our country, and I suspect even most Republicans wouldn't vote to make them law, and I predict they will not vote to make them law. Still, many of its proposals must be taken very seriously.

The Republican budget conference report includes reconciliation instructions to fast-track yet another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, jeopardizing affordable coverage for millions of Americans with no alternative in sight.

It continues the Republican policy of sequester for nondefense priorities this year—a disinvestment suggestion, an undermining of America's economy and its quality of life—and further limits our ability to invest in priorities like education, research, and infrastructure by \$496 billion below sequester levels over the ensuing decade. This is the same sequester policy that the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” Let me repeat that. He is the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, and he said that the policies being pursued in this budget are “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” He is right.

Shamelessly, they propose to do all of this while exempting defense spending from the sequester caps. Defense spending needs to be raised. It ought to be raised honestly and not pretend that some slush fund will pay for, not contingencies, which it is intended to do, but for regular defense investments, which we need to do.

This budget conference report is, essentially, a work of fiction, promulgated as a message to the Republican base. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Instead, let us work together in a bipartisan way to replace the unrealistic and ill-conceived—not my words but HAL ROGERS' words—and, I would add, completely unworkable sequester caps with an alternative that enables Congress to invest in America's future growth and prosperity.

That is what our constituents want. That is what we owe them—honesty and responsibility. I hope this resolution is defeated.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my friend that we look forward to enacting and bringing forward the policies that are incorporated within this budget. In fact, just last night, the Armed Services Committee passed out on a 60-2 vote policies that are consistent with the spending on the defense area in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who is a wonderfully productive and energetic member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in watching this debate back and forth, I am reminded of the saying: “If you like sausage, don't watch it being made.” The same is true, certainly, with the budget process, in fairness to my colleague from Maryland, and the same is true for the

overall legislative process. It is a decidedly human and imperfect process.

What we have here is a result of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, and it is something that we haven't seen for a long, long while. We certainly didn't see it while HARRY REID was running the Senate. As a consequence of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, we will see debate go to 11:30 or midnight tonight on appropriations bills, and they will do that week, after week, after week going forward. I, myself, will come down with an amendment on Energy and Water. I suspect other Members in this very Chamber will come down with similar amendments, saying, “I think we need to add something here,” or “we need to subtract something here.”

That process of scrubbing the budget is something that has been absent for years. That process is called regular order, but regular folks back home would call it, simply, common sense because it is what they do every day. Vital to any well-run organization is that ability to go in and say, “This isn't working so well over here. I think we need to take from here this low performer and add to this high performer.” It is done in churches; it is done in families; it is done in businesses; and it needs to be done in the Federal Government.

I think, as a matter of process, what we have is awfully, awfully important. For too long, our Federal Government has been running on automatic pilot. Entitlements run on automatic pilot, but, in essence, domestic discretionary has been running on automatic pilot as we run on CRs and omnibus bills. I mean, you would go bankrupt in no time if your mode of operation were to simply say, “I will take what I spent last year, and I am going to spend it again this year.” Yet that is the way the Federal Government has been running, and it is this budget that actually moves us away from that process.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, this is important from the standpoint of democracy. When you have an omnibus bill or a CR, somebody is still deciding what goes into that stuff. It is oftentimes leadership and staff as opposed to rank and file Members going down to the floor and saying, “I think we need to subtract here or to add here.” So there are two different levels that, I think, are awfully important.

Are there still deficiencies? Obviously so. I mean, I think that when you look at the budget cap issue and when you look at the issue of off budget those are both pathways to financial oblivion, and they have got to be addressed. The bigger framework that has been set in place is by moving to regular order and by the House and Senate coming together on a budget—thanks to your leadership, Mr. Chairman—which, I think, is vital. As a consequence, I will be supporting this measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget because of the way that it treats our Nation's veterans.

As I have said during the Budget Committee debates, the Republican proposal does not provide our past and present servicemembers with the resources they need upon their return. Protecting our veterans is not an option—it is our duty. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with quality health care, education, job training, and the long-term treatment they have earned through their service to our Nation.

It is more than just a moral obligation. It is also a wise investment in America's future. The Greatest Generation was not called “the Greatest Generation” in 1946. That term didn't come about until the 1990s. It had as much to do with what our veterans of World War II did after the war, when they came home, as with what they did in it. To ensure success for today's veterans, we need to do much better than the Republican proposal.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOULTON. As a veteran, I see firsthand that insufficient funding for VA programs creates an environment in which our veterans fall through the cracks. I do not support simply throwing money at the current bureaucracy, but insufficient funding for the VA and its programs will only exacerbate this problem.

We ought to be able to agree that caring for our veterans should be a national priority. The budget before us today fails to prioritize our servicemen and -women, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very diligent and dedicated senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I first need to commend and thank Chairman PRICE for all of his hard work in putting this budget resolution together. This is a rare occasion on this floor. It has been a long time since we have had a budget agreement, and it is not an easy thing to do. As one of the House budget conferees, I can tell you that a lot of work has to be done and that a lot of difficult choices have to be made.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a spectacular job in getting this here to the floor.

One of the most important things, Mr. Speaker, that the budget resolution has to do is to, frankly, set the stage so that we can move forward on the appropriations process. We need a budget that puts Congress and our committees on a path to move forward, and this budget resolution does it. It balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes.

It is no secret, I believe—and I think many of us believe—that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect the American people, and it is no secret that the world around us—I think greatly due to the failed foreign policy of this administration—is almost in flames. We see a growing instability, and we see a growing pressure to our allies, and we see the thugs and the enemies of freedom who believe they have a green light.

We must provide for a strong national defense through the robust funding of our troops, of their training, of their equipment, of their readiness. This budget does so. It accomplishes these goals while staying under the budget control caps—in other words, adhering to the law of the land.

□ 1700

It funds the military over the President's request, without breaking the law and without raising taxes. Again, something that is easier said than done, but Chairman PRICE has been able to do that.

At a time when we see China's rapidly growing defense capabilities, North Korea's nuclear weapons program, Iran pursuing theirs, and growing threats from terrorist groups, let's not forget what our number one priority has to be.

This budget resolution reflects our commitment to our national security, to the men and women in uniform, to the safety of the American people. It does so, balancing the budget within 10 years. It does so without raising taxes.

I know it is very easy to be critical; it is very easy to lecture why this is not perfect. It has been a long time coming. I am grateful for the leadership of Mr. PRICE, of his counterpart in the Senate, Chairman ENZI. I ask the Members of this distinguished body to approve this well-thought-out, hard-negotiated budget that funds our priorities, doesn't raise taxes, and even balances within 10 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been focused on trying to make sure we have an economy that works for all Americans.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding. More importantly, I want to thank him for his tireless work as our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget. It is truly a pleasure to serve with him.

A budget is a moral document, a document that really reflects our values as a nation. Unfortunately, this budget just does the opposite. Mr. Speaker,

once again, this Congress is poised to take a huge step in the wrong direction.

The budget agreement before us is truly a work hard, get less budget that uses accounting gimmicks to balance the budget, once again on the backs of the most vulnerable. It calls for cuts to nondefense discretionary programs totaling \$496 billion below the already dismally low sequestered level.

This means further draconian cuts to our education, our infrastructure, veterans, and health programs that have already been eviscerated by slash-and-burn Republican austerity plans.

Today, more than 45 million of our fellow Americans are living in poverty. This agreement will push more people over the brink. With \$300 billion in cuts to SNAP—that is our food assistance—\$431 billion in cuts to Medicare, and a half trillion in cuts to Medicaid, struggling families will continue to fall further and further behind.

We can't forget how these cuts disproportionately affect our communities of color, who are more likely to be living in poverty. What is more, this is the latest in the misguided Republican fixation on repealing the Affordable Care Act, which the House has already voted to repeal over 50 times.

The number of uninsured Americans has gone down by 16 million since it was enacted. Why in the world do you want to take health care away from 16 million people? That is mean.

This agreement continues to use the overseas contingency operation, OCO, account as a slush fund for overbudget Pentagon spending by including—I think it is—\$38 billion over the President's request.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. I introduced an amendment in committee to eliminate the OCO account increase of \$36 billion that was included in the House Republican budget. Members on both sides of the aisle have criticized OCO as an affront to transparency and Congress' constitutionally mandated oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, last month, we introduced our Democratic, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets. Those budgets reflect real solutions to lift Americans out of poverty and to support the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and very cynical agreement that would put us on a path to a greater unequal America that provides less liberty and less justice for all. It doesn't reflect who we are as a nation.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a senior, thoughtful member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote, our Nation is about to take its first step away

from financial ruin and back to prosperity and solvency. Our Nation's debt has literally doubled in 8 years, now exceeding the size of our entire economy. That debt requires us to make interest payments of \$230 billion this year. That is nearly \$2,000 from an average family's taxes just to rent the money that we have already spent.

On our current path, that burden will triple within a decade, eclipsing our entire defense budget. Medicare and Social Security will collapse just a few years after that. Time is not our ally, and the future is not a pleasant place if we continue just a few more years down the road that we have been on.

That is why this budget is so important. It changes the fiscal course of our Nation, slowly pointing us back toward solvency and prosperity. It restores congressional oversight of an abusive Federal bureaucracy.

It rescues our healthcare system from the nightmare of ObamaCare. It rescues Medicare from collapse. It adopts the time-tested progrowth policies that produced the Reagan economic recovery and the unprecedented prosperity of the 1980s.

If we can implement this budget, in 10 years, deficits will turn to surpluses, and we can begin paying down this ruinous debt at a pace that ensures that students now in college will retire into a prosperous, secure, and debt-free America.

It is not perfect, and it is not complete. Ahead of us are many months of legislating to build the governmental streamlining and reforms that it calls for, but if we can set this course and if we can stay this course, one day in the very near future, a new generation of Americans can know just how wonderful it is to awaken and realize that it is morning again in America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another one of our terrific new members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is deeply flawed. It forces hard-working families to work more and take home less and puts our country on the wrong path.

It concerns me that the budget put forth by my Republican colleagues does not address the deep, arbitrary, and damaging budget caps we are facing right now. These caps, which are so bad that they were never meant to become law, are now a reality, a reality that we are gutting our military and harming working men and women and their families in multiple ways.

The gimmicks in the conference report do nothing to address the long-term structural problems that budget cuts have created at the Pentagon, and they do nothing on the nondefense side to help hard-working families buy a home, send their children to college, or enjoy a safe, secure retirement with adequate health care.

Democrats have a better way, a better budget, one that creates greater opportunity for a secure future. We need a secure budget, and we shouldn't stand for anything less.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman. He has done a tremendous job. Again, he has brought another budget to the floor that balances, but he has done something no one has done in 6 years. He has brought a bicameral budget.

That is something that we shouldn't just take for granted, something that the House and Senate couldn't do for quite sometime. Your leadership has been tremendous.

To my friend on the other side, you make a lot of debates, and I look forward to hearing them. I am thankful this time you have more Democrats on the floor helping you than you did a couple weeks ago, and that is helpful. That is helpful for a debate. This is the place we should have it.

Two weeks ago, I was on this floor to talk about a budget. I said that a budget is a vision for the future; it sets out your priorities, but it also shows your values. Well, for the first time in 6 years, the House and Senate have gotten together, worked out our differences, and drafted a bicameral budget. This budget shows America exactly where we stand.

With this budget, we have a choice before us. Do we keep going down our current path? Or do we change course? Our current path adds to the debt; it is stuck in the past. In fact, the budget the Democrats offered would never balance.

I say to my friend, the ranking member: we have a family close in age; we have children about the same age. My question to the other side is simply this: How will our kids invest in the future when they are busy paying for our past?

The budget is a different course. It says that we will balance the budget and then actually start paying down the debt. It says that it is a more dangerous world, so we will increase spending for defense. It says we will repeal ObamaCare, and it says no new taxes. It says that it is time to grow America's economy, not Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the future is not about Washington; it is not about government trying and failing to solve our problems while adding more and more debt that our children and grandchildren have to pay. America's future, our 21st century, will be built by American people. That is what this budget would do. It is the foundation for a strong American future and a future even brighter than our past.

I look forward to taking the first steps to that future. I look forward to not leaving our children our debt, but

leaving them a brighter future where they have greater opportunities.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the Republican leader, who mentioned the children of America, that if the children of America learn Republican math, we are going to be in real trouble because they won't be able to count.

As the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget has said, this kind of budget approach that claims balance because they take the level of revenue from the Affordable Care Act, when at the same time say they are repealing the Affordable Care Act, I think most kids can figure out that that is a shell game, and we are going to be in real trouble if that is the basis of teaching math in our schools, not to mention the fact that we have got a budget here that is squeezing people who are really working hard while providing a green light to tax cuts for people at the very top. That is also not a set of priorities I think that we want to pass on to our children.

We want an economy that works for everybody, an economy where everyone who works hard can get ahead. I don't see how we are going to get our kids ahead by providing tax cuts to folks at the top while cutting our kids' education and making them pay more for their college loans. That is a recipe for decline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and also for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I really want to thank the entire Committee on the Budget and the conferees for doing the hard work and the responsible work of finally focusing on bringing responsibility and fiscal discipline back to Washington.

If you look at what has been happening all across the country, people are struggling. These are tough times. It is a tough economy. People's wages are stagnant. They are paying more for food. They are paying more for electricity. They are surely paying more for health care.

They are looking to Washington and saying: Why doesn't Washington start focusing on these problems? Why doesn't Washington do what families are doing? Hard-working taxpayers live within their means. Why can't Washington do the same?

This budget does that. It focuses on creating a healthy economy, actually getting jobs, and getting people back to work in this country, forcing Washington to finally balance the Federal budget.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this budget, it will represent the first time since

2001 that Congress has come together to pass a budget that balances in the 10-year window. That shouldn't be something that happens every 14 years; that should be something we do every year.

The other side surely didn't do it when they were in the majority. In fact, none of the budgets they brought to the floor ever got to balance—not 10 years, not 20 years, not 50 years. They rack up more debt. They increase taxes. There are over \$2 trillion of new taxes in the President's budget that he proposed, and he never gets to balance.

This budget not only calls for good tax reform to make our country competitive again, lower rates so that families can keep more of their money and invest in themselves and not grow the size of government, but it actually focuses on getting more jobs in this country and stop shipping jobs out of the country.

It repeals the President's healthcare law that is causing so many problems, millions of people losing the good healthcare plans they have and paying more for it.

We have got to finally bring this discipline back and finally force Washington to do what families have been doing and be responsible.

It is a good budget. I am glad that we are going to be bringing it to the floor and passing it. Let's get to doing the other work we need to do to get our economy back on track, and it starts here.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. If you ask most Americans what kind of economy they want, they would say they want an economy that is growing rapidly, with more shared prosperity.

You don't get that kind of economy with trickle-down economics with the kind of theory that is embedded in the Republican budget. That theory is that if you provide tax rate cuts to people at the very top—to millionaires—somehow the benefits are going to trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that in the 2000s under George Bush. It didn't work.

What happened—not surprisingly—is folks at the top who got tax cuts ended up with even more take-home income. Everybody else was either treading water or falling behind. Why we would want a budget based on a failed economic strategy is going to leave the American public scratching their heads.

The approach we recommended was one where we provide more tax relief to hard-working Americans. We wanted to expand the provision for child and dependent tax credits so that people can make sure their kids are in a safe environment while they are at work and not have to break the family bank in order to do it.

We want to invest in our kids' education; we want to invest in scientific research, and we want to pay for it by closing some of those tax breaks that encourage American corporations to ship American jobs and money overseas and getting rid of the special tax rates that hedge fund managers have that hard-working Americans don't.

We proposed fixing a tax system that is rigged in favor of the special interests and the very powerful and changing in a way that provides additional help to people who are being squeezed and are in the middle or working their way into the middle. That is an economic plan that works for everybody in the country, not one that just works for people at the very top.

What we saw just last week was the number one economic priority of our Republican colleagues was to eliminate the estate tax on estates above \$10 million, help 5,500 Americans run up the deficit by \$270 billion, and then come back and say, Hey, the deficit just went up by \$270 billion because we provided an estate tax cut to estates \$10 million and up. Now, let's cut our kids' education. Let's increase the amount we charge seniors for their prescription drugs. Let's raise the cost of student loans. Let's cut our investment in kids' education.

That is what this Republican budget does. It is not that our colleagues don't believe in this failed theory, but you would think, at some point, reality would intrude, and people would say we need an economy that works for every American, not just a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. Let's start again in a way that really reflects the greatness of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. Con. Res. 11.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is appropriate that we begin the process of this debate that is called "and now for the rest of the story."

For folks who are watching and for our colleagues who have been observing this debate and want more information, I would urge you to go to the Web site and take a peek at the resolution,

budget.house.gov. You can get all sorts of information about the positive solutions that we are putting forward.

It is not just our opinion. We have got a lot of folks who are out there supporting the resolution that we put forward.

The 60 Plus Association says:

On behalf of more than 7 million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds the leadership of you and Senate Budget Committee Chairman ENZI in putting forth a responsible balanced budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect today's seniors, but it will also protect our children and grandchildren.

The National Federation of Independent Business says:

On behalf of the NFIB, the Nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts . . . NFIB and small-business owners strongly support your efforts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: the world's largest business federation representing interests of more than 3 million businesses—those are jobs, Mr. Speaker—of all sizes, sectors, and regions strongly supports your resolution.

The Association of Mature American Citizens:

On behalf of 1.3 million members of AMAC . . . I am writing to applaud the House and Senate for working to pass a budget this year and to convey our strong support for the policies set forth therein.

There is significant support literally from across the country, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address some very specific issues that have come forward because, as I say, now, it is time for the rest of the story.

Our friends talk about the lack of growth within our budget. In fact, that is not the case. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office stipulates that over \$400 million in growth will occur in the first 10-year period of time. We believe it will be much more than that because we believe in a dynamic market.

We believe that, when you allow the economy to thrive, when you allow folks to have more jobs and more opportunity and more dreams realized, that in fact you get the economy rolling to a greater degree and actually more increase in growth will occur within the economy.

We have heard from our friends on the other side about all these tax increases that are in this budget. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you very clearly: there are no tax increases in this budget. We balance the budget within a 10-year period of time with no tax increases. What they describe is their extrapolation on what they think policy is going to be.

As you know and our colleagues in this Chamber know, it is not the Budget Committee that brings forward tax resolutions. It is the Ways and Means Committee. We charge the Ways and Means Committee with coming forward with progrowth tax policy to get this economy rolling again and to actually get rates down—yes, for large and

small businesses, so that we can create more jobs, but, yes, Mr. Speaker, for the American people as well.

That is our vision. That is our goal. That is what we think ought to occur again so that more dreams can be realized and more Americans can have the kind of opportunity that they so desire.

We have heard a lot of talk about student loans. Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution does not decrease student loans, does not decrease the Pell grants. It is important that the American people know that. If you don't believe it, just go to the Web site. Read the resolution at budget.house.gov.

We have heard over and over and over again about the talk on health care. In fact, one individual on the other side of the aisle said we were "taking away health care from 16 million."

Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, nonsense—it just simply is not so. What we believe is that we ought to have a healthcare system that actually works for patients and families and doctors and allows them to make medical decisions and healthcare decisions, not Washington, D.C., not the Federal Government. That is not what the American people want.

We are mired in a system right now that the President forced down the throats of the American people and our friends on the other side of the aisle forced down the throats of those of us in this Congress a few short years ago. We are mired in a system that actually is providing less quality of care and less affordability and less access to care.

That is not what we believe ought to happen. What we do is charge the committees with coming forward with that patient-centered solution, a solution that will again put patients and families and doctors in charge.

Then we hear about continuing the sequester. You are right. We do follow the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, because the budget resolution can't change the sequester.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I invite them to work together as we move forward over the next number of months to get together and solve the challenge of sequester in a responsible way by decreasing spending on the mandatory side so that we can find the resources that are so vitally necessary on the discretionary side. I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. It is a budget that would get folks back to work. It is a budget that would save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, put us on a path to saving Social Security. It is a budget that protects our national defense. It is a budget that deserves support in this Chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the House Budget Committee and the Office of the Sixth District of Georgia. We are on the cusp of agreeing to

this budget resolution, due in large part, to the hard work and dedication of my staff. For the past four months, they have worked many long hours and out of the spotlight to help build a budget that balances within 10 years. It has been an honor to work with each of these staff members as they have helped craft a budget this Congress can be proud of, and the staff should be proud of what they have helped accomplish.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE STAFF

Alex Campau, Alex Stoddard, Amanda Street, Andy Morton, Ben Garndenhour, Brad Watson, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Emily Goff, Ersin Aydin, Jane Lee, Jenna Speelman, Jim Bates, Jim Herz, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Kara McKee, Kelle Long, Kyle Cormney, Mary Popadiuk, Pat Knudsen, Paul Restuccia, Rich Kisielowski, Rick May, Ryan Murphy, Tim Flynn, William Allison.

PERSONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICE STAFF

Brent Robertson, Carla DiBlasio, Charlene Puchalla, Cheyenne Foster, Daniel Grey, Devin Kreci, Gary Beck, Jennifer Poole, Kris Skrzycki, Kyle McGowan, Kyle Zebley, Megan Wells, Meghan Dugan, Meghan Graf, Ryan Brooks, Tina McIntosh, Warren Negri.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Griffith	Pitts
Aderholt	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Allen	Guinta	Poliquin
Amodei	Guthrie	Pompeo
Babin	Hanna	Posey
Barletta	Hardy	Price, Tom
Barr	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harris	Reed
Benishek	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Black	Hill	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Blum	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boehner	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hunter	Rokita
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Russell
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Knight	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shuster
Comstock	Lance	Simpson
Conaway	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cook	Long	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Love	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stefanik
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Lummis	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Stutzman
Denham	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Marino	Thornberry
DeSantis	McCarthy	Tiberi
DesJarlais	McCaul	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Trott
Dold	McHenry	Turner
Duffy	McKinley	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	Rodgers	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Meadows	Walden
Farenthold	Meehan	Walker
Fincher	Messer	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Flores	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Forbes	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Fortenberry	Mullin	Whitfield
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Newhouse	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Womack
Gohmert	Nugent	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunes	Yoder
Gosar	Olson	Yoho
Gowdy	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Granger	Palmer	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Pearce	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Perry	
	Pittenger	

NAYS—197

Adams	Bonamici	Carney
Aguiar	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Amash	F.	Cartwright
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Connolly	Jolly	Peters
Conyers	Jones	Peterson
Cooper	Kaptur	Pingree
Costa	Katko	Pocan
Courtney	Keating	Polis
Crawford	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cuellar	Kildee	Rangel
Cummings	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeGette	Labrador	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Levin	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff
F.	LoBiondo	Schrader
Duckworth	Loebach	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Ellison	Lowe	Serrano
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	(NM)	Sherman
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Farr	(NM)	Sires
Fattah	Lynch	Slaughter
Foster	Maloney,	Speier
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Takai
Gabbard	Massie	Takano
Gallego	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Gibson	McDermott	Titus
Graham	McGovern	Tonko
Grayson	McNerney	Torres
Green, Al	McSally	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Meeks	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Meng	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Moore	Veasey
Hahn	Moulton	Vela
Hastings	Mulvaney	Velázquez
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Higgins	Nadler	Walz
Himes	Napolitano	Walters, Maxine
Honda	Neal	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	Nolan	Welch
Huffman	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Israel	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Zinke
Jeffries	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Garrett	Payne	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	
Hinojosa	Wagner	

□ 1815

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, COLE, STEWART, FINCHER, and REICHERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2029.