

The words of Winston Churchill, which were spoken during a different battle, echo true today. He stated, "This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end; but it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move beyond last year's business and start doing the work the American people sent us here to do. Tomorrow, we will take up legislation that will save us not billions but trillions; and as this House considers addressing the debt ceiling, the Senate and the President need to know that these cuts do not represent the end—they represent our resolve to continue the fight.

MEDICAID BLOCK GRANTS PROGRAM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican plan to gut Medicaid. This plan isn't about finding cost-effective ways to improve Medicaid. It's about limiting health care for some of the most vulnerable members of our society.

It's telling seniors they no longer qualify for their nursing home care. It's taking away access to well child visits. The Medicaid program isn't just numbers on a balance sheet; it's the only access to care for millions of low-income seniors, poor children and people with disabilities.

Under the Republican proposal, there will be less access and less care, especially in times of economic stress, like what we are going through today. Medicaid rolls swell as people lose jobs and families lose income. Under the Republican block grant scheme, tough times would mean even tougher times for the newly unemployed, the frail and the young.

As a nurse, I believe a key moral measure of our society is how we treat the least among us. This irresponsible Republican proposal just doesn't measure up.

CREATING JOBS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our President for taking a mature and comprehensive approach to the problems we face.

When people have a need to lose weight, they both reduce their caloric content and they increase their exercise. It's the same thing with the deficit we have. You have to have cuts or reforms, but you also have to have more revenue.

The President's proposal yesterday about finally getting around to taxing the millionaires and the billionaires and having them contribute to the need to reduce our deficit is so impor-

tant, while at the same time reforming Medicare, not eliminating Medicare. That's what is scary: eliminating Medicare for seniors, threatening Social Security, and not providing an innovative program to create jobs. Jobs is the issue. We need to create jobs in this country, and we haven't seen it coming forth.

I praise the President for his mature approach to the situation, and I encourage others to fall in line.

IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE, ONLY THE BIG DOGS EAT

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my name is Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN, and I'm from the great State of Florida, the home of Claude Pepper.

Claude Pepper was the champion for senior citizens and the elderly, and he would be so appalled by the bill that the Republicans are bringing to the House floor tomorrow, which will gut and privatize Medicaid and Medicare in order to give tax cuts to the millionaires and billionaires. That's shocking—that's shocking to me—but Republicans are doing it after one hearing, which is unacceptable.

You talk about open government. Why is it that we have not had hearings where we bring in our stakeholders and talk about how this would affect senior citizens?

How can you dare to propose that people who may not even make \$6,000 a year have to pay an additional \$6,000 a year for health care insurance?

It's so sad that, in the people's House, only the big dogs eat.

□ 1120

REPUBLICAN BUDGET ENDS MEDICARE AS WE KNOW IT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it's sort of ironic that today we're going to bring up a budget, the Republican budget, that would end Medicare as we know it, but at the same time seek to repeal the health care reform legislation, or at least defund it.

I don't understand how my Republican colleagues keep talking about repealing or defunding health care reform and yet have nothing to replace it with, and in this case are trying to gut or end as we know it the existing health care programs that we have for senior citizens and the disabled in the case of Medicare, and in the case of Medicaid for low-income people.

They would tell seniors, in their budget, that they're supposed to go out and buy their own health insurance, and somehow they're going to give them some help. They call it premium support from the Federal Government.

But they're now going to have to pay out of pocket to just buy their insurance more and more. So they have to pay out of pocket for the premium, they have to pay out of pocket for a deductible, and they have to pay out of pocket for the copay. Where does it end?

THE AMERICAN DREAM

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the American Dream.

The American Dream, that's what motivated the Asian American hotel owners to come to this country. Many of those hotel owners came here under circumstances similar to that of my dad. They came here to live the American Dream, but not just for us. By providing over half a million jobs to Americans throughout this great country, the Asian American Hotel Owners Association helped to provide the American Dream to all of us.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 34, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 223 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 223

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Hinchey of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the

Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the concurrent resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. House Resolution 223 provides for a structured rule for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 34. This rule makes in order every complete substitute submitted to the Rules Committee. Continuing a bipartisan tradition, we are making in order four Democratic substitutes and one Republican substitute, providing 4 hours of general debate, with ample debate on each substitute. This will allow the House to work its will and adopt a budget blueprint for fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. The underlying legislation is our budget for 2012. Our 2012 budget is our blueprint for a strong and secure future for the next generation.

Each of us is here today because those who came before us made amaz-

ing sacrifices for the next generation—us—keeping alive the American Dream. In the last century alone, our parents and grandparents have won two world wars, overcome the Great Depression, defeated communism, and created the most prosperous and vibrant society in the history of mankind.

Today it is our turn. It is our turn to take a bold and necessary step to ensure that we pass on to our children this great blessing called America, and even a stronger America than the one we received from our parents.

PAUL RYAN calls his plan The Path to Prosperity. I call it leadership. It is what our country has been thirsting for. It confronts our problems head on, and it proposes reasonable and responsible solutions to get us back on track.

Our plan creates jobs, real jobs, 1 million new jobs in America in the first year alone. It stimulates our economy, increasing our GDP by \$1.5 trillion in the next 10 years. It protects and strengthens Social Security and Medicare. Let me say that one more time because so many people are trying to demagogue the issue: Our plan strengthens and protects Social Security and Medicare for the next generation of Americans. And it also reduces job-killing government spending by \$6.2 trillion in the next 10 years.

Yesterday, our President, he got on board. Two months ago, he gave us his 2012 budget, and now we have 2012 2.0, the second time around. But the plan hasn't changed much, sir. The plan is basically the same. So let's compare our plan in the next 10 years to President Obama's plan over the next 12 years.

President Obama would add \$4 trillion to our debt, leaving us at the end of the next decade with \$26 trillion of debt, according to the CBO. Even our Democratic colleagues in the House agree, and they have presented a plan that breaks from their own President, cutting an additional \$1.2 trillion off the deficit. The Republican budget cuts \$6.2 trillion, bringing spending to under 20 percent of our economy.

The Republican plan proposes specific and responsible solutions to strengthen Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. The President talks very vaguely about a plan to cut waste and streamline Medicare and Medicaid, proposing to create yet another unelected commission to solve all of our problems. We don't need more unelected bureaucrats in Washington, sir, enlarging the scope of government. That's not real leadership.

The President tries to tax our way out of debt, placing the burden on those earning more than \$100,000. But the problem, sir, is a simple one. If we were to tax these individuals 100 percent of their income, we still cannot cover our deficits this year alone. As a matter of fact, to tax our way out of debt, we would need to increase taxes across the board on every man, on every woman, and on every business by 60 percent. You simply cannot tax your

way out of this debt. Imagine the effects this would have on our economy.

□ 1130

The President's budget cuts \$400 billion out of our military. In the time that he has led us into Libya, in the time that we have two conflicts going on, it cuts \$400 billion away from the men and women who are fighting for freedom, dying for liberty.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the urgent need to cut the Nation's deficit. We need to have serious discussions and make tough decisions about how we prevent a fiscal crisis in our country, and certainly we are beginning those discussions.

But, sadly, today—and I must emphasize this—sadly, today this bill will end Medicare and cost shift to seniors \$6,000 more a year. And why are they doing that? They get to pay for more tax breaks for Big Oil and millionaires, who are untouched in this country. That really is strange deficit reduction to me.

Frankly, if I had my druthers, I would start by ending the war in Afghanistan. That war is costing us \$8 billion a month, and we're paying to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan while our own infrastructure crumbles and while we feel we cannot afford to spend any of our money on those of us who live here and pay the costs.

Just yesterday, the President presented another way to solve our fiscal crisis, as he laid out a budget that will responsibly reduce the spending and that simplifies the Tax Code, which is so important, so that, as the President said, and this is critical to understand, the taxes you pay are not going to be determined by the accountant you can afford. This is good news for all Americans.

The President's budget puts us on the right track to ending the deficit crisis while investing in the long-term success of our economy and our country. Unfortunately, the thought is far too prevalent in this House that we need not invest in ourselves, that we can just shut down programs and everybody will be happy and singing in the streets. Not likely.

But despite the responsible vision the President presented yesterday, we stand here today debating a reckless Republican budget that will destroy programs like Medicare while extending the tax cuts to corporations and America's rich.

The budget starts with Medicare, eliminating the program that provides secure and affordable health care in old age. And it is eliminated. People who

are on Medicare now will be grandfathered in. In the future what they will get will be a voucher with a certain amount of Federal money that goes with it. They are then required to go to the best they can in the private market to meet their health care needs.

As we watch the cost in the private market climb, we would have to ask ourselves, Would this government help out, as Medicare would, by raising the money that the government puts in to replace it? No, it wouldn't. So under this plan a senior in the year 2021, and I hope there are a lot of them in this House who will follow me on this, will pay \$6,000 more for the private insurance than they would have under Medicare. Now, if your insurance costs more than that, you had better find a way to pay your creditors because you're going to be on your own.

Today's budget bill also threatens the future of Social Security. It includes a trigger mechanism that would allow Social Security cuts to be rushed through the Congress at a future date. This trigger is an abuse of the legislative process and puts Social Security on the chopping block for future cuts.

Furthermore, in an act that defies all logic, this bill cripples the watch dogs that we created just last year to police the big banks who created the financial crisis. Why in the world would we want to do that?

In addition to Medicare and Social Security, it cuts 70 percent of our investments in clean energy. It cuts 25 percent of our education funding. It cuts out 30 percent of our transportation funding, including significantly less money for a high-speed rail network designed to free us from foreign oil.

By stopping investments in key competitive areas, our Nation is abandoning jobs and future economic opportunities that come with clean energy, with a new transportation network, and the invaluable work of educating our children. This is the burden 90 percent of Americans are asked to share.

Meanwhile, the Republican budget would make permanent the Bush-era tax cuts that further cut taxes for corporations and America's richest individuals, including the oil companies. Do they need a Federal subsidy? I think not. Had the Bush tax cuts been allowed to expire in December, we would almost be able to cut our deficit in half within a few months from now.

The Republican majority apparently believes that the ones who have the most should sacrifice the least. Some have claimed tax cuts create jobs. We hear that a lot around here. But analysis by respected experts, such as Pulitzer Prize winner and former New York Times tax expert David Clay Johnston, have shown that tax cuts do nothing to spur the economy and create jobs; they simply pad the wallets of the wealthiest among us in times of a national need.

As we shape a budget for 2012, we must craft legislation that truly shares

the entire Nation's sacrifice, not a budget that ends Medicare while handing more tax giveaways to those who need it the least and in many cases are asking not to be given it.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to address a few points that Congresswoman SLAUGHTER brought up.

I have scoured the budget looking for this notion of a voucher system for Medicare. I've scoured the budget and simply cannot find anything that is, in fact, a voucher system. I have seen things about premium support.

But let's just talk about Medicare for a quick second. \$800 billion the President has suggested must come out of Medicare in order to pay for national health care. So we are going to take benefits from our senior citizens in an attempt to provide health care benefits for 19- and 20-year-olds. In fact, that \$800 billion is one way to actually increase the cost to every senior citizen in our country. Increasing taxes by \$2 trillion in the next 12 months is a wonderful way to make our economy stumble, and that's what the President has suggested.

Finally, you cannot increase taxes on the very job creators themselves and then ask them to continue to create jobs.

□ 1140

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a crisis in the country today. Imagine back home in your family budget if for every dollar you spent, 40 cents was borrowed. Surely you would bring your entire family to the kitchen table and say, okay, what can we cut out? We cannot continue to borrow 40 cents for every dollar we spend. You would make changes in your household budget. But for some reason, many in Washington, D.C. want to stick their head in the sand and say, no, we really don't have to do this. And yet right now the national debt is 90 percent of the GDP.

We borrow billions of dollars a year from China, which is not exactly a great idea in terms of national security. I sit on the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations. We watch China year in, year out building up their army, and yet we go to them over and over again for more money. And yet, while we do that, those in Washington, D.C., don't want to do anything.

We heard yesterday the President's mulligan budget. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is responsible to submit his budget to Congress each year, which the President did in February, totally

ignoring his own deficit commission's recommendations. The Simpson-Bowles language was not in there. And yet, yesterday, the President decided, oh, well, give me one more chance, I'm going to introduce another budget, which has a lot of phony numbers in there and a lot of false promises and calls for more studies and commissions. I ask my Democrat friends, is that budget going to be on the floor today? Are we going to be able to offer it?

I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If the Speaker would allow, we are going to be offering a Democratic alternative today, and everyone will have a chance to see the alternative.

Mr. KINGSTON. You will be offering the budget the President talked about yesterday? I'm going to yield back to my friend from Maryland, but I want to say this: Unlike when you guys were in charge, we are offering the Democrats opportunities to offer budgets. We think it's very important, because we want the best of your ideas, and we think the best of our ideas can be combined together for the best of America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield for 5 seconds? Because you will have that opportunity to vote on a Democratic alternative.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am going to yield to my friend, but here's what I want to say, that we keep hearing over and over again in the last 24 hours about the President's wonderful mulligan budget that he offered yesterday, but I don't believe it's going to be offered on the floor of the House.

Now let me yield to my friend.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As I indicated, you will have a Democratic alternative budget that we're going to put forward, and it will present a very clear choice for the Members. We will present a budget that achieves steady, predictable deficit reduction. Again, we make different choices in how we do it, and that is the center of the debate. So everyone will have an opportunity to vote on an alternative budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask specifically, the mulligan budget that the President offered yesterday, will it be on the floor of the House today?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The President did not offer what we call a budget. He offered what was an outline, an approach, that he wants people to look at on a bipartisan basis. That's what the President proposed yesterday.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me thank my friend from Maryland for answering this, because I do think it's important for the Democrats to be given an opportunity to offer an alternative budget, and I'm glad that you will be, and there will be five such budgets. And I'm hoping even if your budgets don't pass, that we can still pick and choose some parts of those, and there will be some parts of our budget that you like and want to support as well.

But I want to emphasize over and over again that the President, who yesterday tried to reclaim some territory

because he did not take on the recommendations of his own deficit reduction commission, he was not offering a budget yesterday. What he did was give a speech. Now, the President is kind of becoming the Spectator in Chief or the Speaker in Chief. He's the guy who offers a budget, and then yesterday decides to give a speech. Well, the time has come and gone for speeches.

What our budget does is take on some serious changes in our spending habit. It does tackle the difficult choices that we have on Medicaid and Medicare. It does not create a voucher system; it is a supplemental system which will give seniors more choices. And it doesn't affect anybody 55 years or older, which is very important.

But we will hear from the liberals in this community the cage rattling of senior citizens over and over again, and that's why we can't make progress in this town, because we always reduce policy to politics.

The time to put policy first is now. We've got to tone down our rhetoric and say, you know what, here is a plan to save and protect and preserve Medicaid and Medicare, not for the next election, not for politicians, but for America's future seniors. The baby boomers who are under 55 years old will have a Medicare/Medicaid plan that they can count on because it will be there. If we don't change, it will not be there for them.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, later in this debate, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order Mr. TONKO's amendment to protect Medicare, TRICARE, and veterans' health care from privatization or arbitrary spending caps.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

I'm glad my colleague raised the issue of the bipartisan fiscal commission, because the fiscal commission took a look at the Republican budget plan and said it was not balanced and not comprehensive and not a way to achieve deficit reduction in a responsible way. That was the verdict of the bipartisan commission.

Why did they say it was unbalanced? Because the Republican budget provides big tax breaks for special interests. You don't get rid of the subsidies to the big oil companies. You want to give additional tax breaks to the very wealthy, including millionaires. And what do you do for the tradeoff? You cut funding for education for kids and you do end the Medicare guarantee. We're going to have time to talk about other parts of the bill later on, but I want to talk about that now because it's going to be the subject of the previous question.

What this budget does is say to seniors, you no longer may stay in the Medicare program today; you have to

go into the private insurance market. And the way it saves money is it says, as those costs in the private insurance market continue to go up, you are not going to get premium support that will keep up with it. You're going to get something that's a relatively fixed value compared to the rapidly rising health care costs, which is why, as the President said yesterday, in the year 2022 seniors would pay more under the Republican budget plan by over \$6,300 than they do under current Medicare. And that continues to rise and rise and rise.

I want to put an end today to this other talking point we keep hearing, that somehow they're offering seniors what Members of Congress have. It's not true. What Members of Congress have is something called a fair share formula under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. So as premiums go up, the risk to Members of Congress and other Federal employees is fixed at a certain percentage. Not true under the Republican Medicare plan. The way it saves money in the out years is in fact to make sure that share between Medicare and the senior is not fixed, that the senior has to pick up more of the cost. That is a fact. And that is how they make money in the out years, by putting it on the backs of seniors, even while they say they're going to bring down the top tax rate by 30 percent for the wealthiest people in this country. That's the kind of choices we're facing here.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) had an amendment before the Rules Committee on exactly this issue of ending Medicare and the guarantee that it provides in saying you've got to go into the private system.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. His amendment makes the point that if you think this is a good idea, if the Republicans think this is such a good idea, why don't you apply it to veterans? Why don't you apply it to active service personnel? If it is such a great thing, why don't you turn them into voucher premium support—whatever you want—a kind of plan where they have to eat the rising cost of health care?

Members are going to have an opportunity. If you vote "no" on the previous question, you will be able to vote to say, let's not turn Medicare into a voucher premium support, let's not end the guarantee, and let's not do that for our military personnel or our veterans either.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let's just clear up a simple point here. The only specified savings in this budget are from raising taxes and cutting the military. If we really wanted to have an opportunity to make Medicare last longer, we could simply repeal ObamaCare, repeal national health care, and put the \$800 billion back into Medicare.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The Democratic alternative says, yes, we should ask the highest income earners, the folks at the top 2 percent, to simply pay the same rate that they paid during the Clinton administration when the economy was roaring and we created 20 million jobs.

□ 1150

That's what the choices are before us, and that's exactly the point you're making. You want to end the Medicare guarantee for seniors at the same time you want to give tax breaks to folks at the very top. That's your choice. You can make it, but we don't think that's the choice the American people want to make.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Congressman, the fact is simple. We could tax those over \$100,000 a year 100 percent and we still simply could not close the deficit for this year.

The fact of the matter is people talk about this government getting smaller, and the President's original budget spent \$47 trillion in the next 10 years—an \$8.7 trillion increase in spending. We're talking about a \$2 trillion increase in spending in the next 12 months in taxes. We're not talking about reducing the size and scope of this government.

We must get ourselves on a completely different trajectory. We must bend the trajectory back towards the American people, back towards the private sector, and eliminate the disincentive for growth in our economy called taxation.

So to the extent that we can flatten the tax, spread the risk, we find ourselves in a more prosperous society with a stronger economy led by those folks in the private sector. Entrepreneurs have an opportunity to take those dollars and reinvest them in such a way to create more jobs. It is a simple formula.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it's been roughly a hundred days since I've been here. I'm one of the new folks in Congress. I began with my very first presentation several months ago congratulating my opponents across the aisle for saying all of the right things about where we're going to go this year, about how concerned they were about cutting spending, how concerned they were about balancing the budget. And I was actually excited at that time to hear folks across the aisle using a lot of the same language that we were using. Apparently, by now, I guess I have to expose myself for being somewhat naive.

Here we are again today hearing the exact same language, that the other side is deathly serious about cutting

spending, the other side is deathly serious about balancing the budget, and I've come to realize, as I think most of America has, that the words simply don't match up to the language.

I guess, to a certain extent, I should be happy that we are here at least having this debate. We are here today discussing the 2012 budget for the first time. This will be the first time in 2 years this debate has taken place on this floor since there was no budget last year offered by my colleagues across the way.

I can simply ask them: If you are indeed serious today about balancing the budget, serious today about getting spending under control, where have you been for the last 4 years? Where were you last year when this debate was not even allowed to take place on the floor of the House of Representatives?

But let's put that behind us now. Let's move on to the 2012 budget. What are we seeing? We're seeing some wonderful language out of our colleagues on the other side. We saw the President in his State of the Union say a lot of the things that folks like me wanted to hear. And then we saw a budget that did absolutely nothing out of the White House—nothing. A budget that was decried by *The Washington Post* as actually being void of ideas and failing to lead.

So what did our side do? We led. And in our budget, we actually introduced specific proposals on how to solve the problem. Did you like them? No. Did I like all of them? No. Are we all going to like all of the proposals? No chance. But at least we offered ideas, specific ideas.

Then yesterday we heard the President was going to do the same thing, that he was going to meet us, that he wasn't going to attack us. He was actually going to put specific ideas on the table and invited my colleagues to sit in the front row while he called them un-American and again refused to give any specifics.

Mr. Speaker, you will not see the President's budget offered today or tomorrow as an amendment. You will not see the budget that the President discussed yesterday offered as an amendment because it simply does not meet the specific requirements of being a budget amendment. It doesn't even come close.

What the President talked about last night was more empty ideas and political rhetoric. The speech was introduced by his campaign manager, not by his Director of the Office of Management and Budget, not by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was a political speech. I'm extraordinarily frustrated with that.

I have an economics background. I'd love to sit and talk about the economic realities that face our Nation. It is so difficult to do when the other side, led by the President, simply wants to engage in politics.

Here again today we've seen it. We've seen talking points that somehow our

proposal is going to require seniors to pay \$6,000 out of pocket. We've looked for the last 12 hours to try and find that, Mr. Speaker, and we can't find it. What we did find, however, was the CBO report that says that the payment under our proposed system for 65-year-olds in 2020, 10 years on, would be the exact same as it would be under Medicare, that the spending per capita on seniors under our proposal 10 years on would be the same as it is under the current law.

I'm not sure where the \$6,300 is coming from. My guess is it's coming from somebody's political office and not from some economic think tank.

You heard my esteemed colleague from Maryland, whom I've enjoyed working with on the Budget Committee, talk about the fiscal commission. I think lost in a lot of the discussion yesterday about the President's speech were the comments that one of the cochairs of that committee made as he walked out of the room after the President gave his speech, and they said, "Mr. Simpson, what do you think the course of action should be from here on out?" And his answer was, "Pray."

Is that what we've come to as a Nation, that the best chance we have to balance our budget is prayer? I'm a big believer in prayer, don't get me wrong, but we need to be met on the real issues. We cannot have the other side continuing to meet our specific proposals with rhetoric.

To the extent that we will see specific proposals, I think we saw a brief introduction to it during the amendment process in the committee. Every single Democrat amendment—that's not fair. There were three or four, including one or two that I think I voted for. We did have a couple of bipartisan amendments pass. But the large majority of the Democrat proposals of amendments to this budget during the budget process were fairly simply described as increased taxes and increased spending. It was a series of increased taxes and increased spending.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that's what we're going to see for the next few days, and it's a tremendous loss that here we are able to discuss the budget for the first time in 2 years that the debate will be purely political.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the ranking member.

If my colleague would remember, one of the first amendments that was offered was to say let's be serious about the deficit. Let's have shared sacrifice. Let's ask those folks paying over a million dollars to go back to the same tax rates that they were during the Clinton administration and put some of that money to deficit reduction.

We offered other amendments by saying let's let the big oil companies do a little less with the taxpayer subsidies and focus that on higher priorities.

The gentleman asked where the figure was that a senior would have to pay \$6,000 more in the year 2022 under the Republican proposal. That is from the CBO letter to the chairman of the Budget Committee where they did their analysis of the long-term impact. It was not a Republican outfit. It was not a Democratic outfit. In fact, the chairman of the committee has made it clear that he has used the CBO baseline for the purpose of his own budget. This is out of a CBO report. And I think we need to take it seriously, because we can all have our own arguments and opinions, but there are certain facts that we can't run away from, and that's one of them.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Chairman DREIER.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation not only to the gentleman from North Charleston for his superb management of this rule, but also to salute my friend from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), who serves from the Rules Committee to the Committee on the Budget.

We actually have clearly changed the entire trajectory with the budget that we are going to consider with this rule. And I should say that, as I listened to the exchange that took place between Messrs. VAN HOLLEN and KINGSTON earlier, we've changed the debate.

In the last session of Congress, Mr. Speaker, there was not a budget considered. We didn't go through this. Yet we are going to have every single substitute—from the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. COOPER, the Democratic substitute—all considered, and we're going to have a free-flowing debate today and tomorrow on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that yesterday I stood here at 1:30 just as the President was getting ready to deliver his speech, and I indicated some real hope and optimism by virtue of the fact that early indications were that the President would be talking about the need for entitlement reform. I have to say that I was more than disappointed in the fact that the speech was a little more political than I thought it could have been, and it was at best a very first step, but a little too modest for my tastes.

□ 1200

Madam Speaker, it is essential that we work in a bipartisan way to take on the burden and the cost of Medicare especially, and Social Security as well. Why? So that we can save, not abolish, Medicare and Social Security. The American people have been compelled throughout their entire lifetimes to pay the FICA tax. They in fact should have an opportunity to have what are much needed health care and retirement benefits. And the course that

we're on right now, Madam Speaker, has created a scenario whereby they will be lost. That's why we are working to save it. It can only be done, I believe, Madam Speaker, if we do it in a bipartisan way.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague from New York, former chair of the Rules Committee, who I had the privilege of serving under, for allowing me this time.

Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak against the rule and against the Republican budget. Last year was a good year for CEOs at America's biggest companies. The average CEO got a 12 percent raise and made about \$10 million. Now the Republicans want to give that same CEO a 30 percent tax cut. That's right. While the average American family is struggling with gas prices that went up 93 cents in the last year, while working Americans tried to figure out how to afford health care or how to send their children to college, the Republicans have been busy trying to figure out how to cut taxes for CEOs by one-third.

Of course, you can't cut taxes that dramatically for the richest Americans without cutting spending somewhere else. Someone has to pay for the tax cuts. And in the Republican budget, the people who pay the price are seniors and the middle class. Under their budget, seniors will pay when Medicare as we know it is ended and replaced with a voucher system that will be a windfall for insurance companies but will double health care costs for seniors. And the middle class will pay when deductions for home mortgages or health insurance are repealed to pay for those CEO tax cuts.

Madam Speaker, Republicans simply have the wrong priorities, putting the burden of the budget on seniors and the middle class while giving big tax breaks to the wealthy and handing out handouts to insurance companies. I don't share those values. This is not a budget that serves the American people well.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget before the House today. I am pleased that the Rules Committee has made the submitted substitute budgets in order so that we can have a full debate on our Nation's priorities over the next several years. And in my view, the Ryan budget represents exactly the wrong priorities.

It would eliminate Medicare as we know it, forcing seniors to pay thousands of dollars more every year for their health care. It would bring back

the doughnut hole, allow insurance companies to once again discriminate based upon preexisting conditions, and kick young people off their parents' insurance plans. It would slash needed investments in education, infrastructure, medical research, environmental protection, and hunger programs. And it would still result in deficits as far as the eye can see.

And at the same time, the Ryan budget would give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. The top rate under the Ryan budget would be the lowest since 1931, which is appropriate, Madam Speaker, because this is a budget that only Herbert Hoover could love. Apparently, the Republican leadership of this House would like to reverse the last 80 years of social progress in this country.

In short, I believe this budget would represent the largest redistribution of wealth from the middle class and the poor to the wealthy in American history. Now, some have called this approach trickle-down economics on steroids. But it's worse than trickle-down, Madam Speaker; it's gusher-up. Over the last several years, working families have been struggling, struggling to find a job, struggling to pay their mortgages, to pay the utility bills and their health care bills, struggling to put food on the table and put their kids through college. To them, the Republicans would say, "Tough luck."

At the same time, the very wealthiest Americans and corporations have enjoyed record profits. And to them the Republicans would say, "You need more help." As President Obama said so eloquently yesterday, "That's not the America that I grew up in. That's not the America I want for my children and for my grandchildren."

We can and we must do better. The Democratic alternative offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN is a sensible, practical, and, most importantly, fair way to address our long-term fiscal challenges while at the same time investing in our future. I urge my colleagues to support that alternative and to reject the Ryan budget.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee and my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in the last week I have twice offered an amendment to protect health care for seniors, veterans, and active duty military and military families. And to my great disappointment, the Republican majority has twice blocked this effort, first in committee, where Republicans voted unanimously on a party line vote to end Medicare, and again yesterday, when the Republican leadership refused to allow this amendment to be heard, debated, and voted on in this Chamber.

I have twice asked my Republican colleagues to honor the Constitution. They must allow the democratically elected representatives of the American people to have an honest up or down vote on whether or not we support privatizing Medicare, a trend that could lead to similar privatized plans for the health coverage provided to our troops and veterans. For if they honestly believe that seniors will receive quality care at a more affordable price to the taxpayer, what's to stop them from going after TRICARE and the VA?

My amendment will protect health care provided to seniors and the disabled from being privatized or being subject to arbitrary spending caps. It would extend the same protection to health coverage for active duty military and their families, as well as veterans. This amendment would protect Medicare, TRICARE, and VA health care from being eliminated and replaced with voucher or premium support programs.

The Road to Ruin budget ends Medicare. This is a program that 46 million seniors and disabled individuals rely on for their health care. Rather than guaranteed benefits, seniors and the disabled will be left with a voucher, or so-called premium support, that by design cannot and will not keep up with rising health care costs. The private market views seniors as a risky and expensive investment. So too the disabled. So too military servicemembers and veterans who have unique health needs earned through their sacrifice in service to America.

The question before us today is not whether to reduce the deficit, but how. We have balanced the budget before without ending Medicare. We can do it again without the painful consequences that the Republican plan would initiate, where our seniors would pay 68 cents of every dollar of insurance required as compared to Congress paying 28 cents on every dollar.

Forty-six million people rely on Medicare today. Even more will depend on it in the future. Those many millions deserve a vote. That vote has been denied to them by the Republican leadership of the House.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think it's time that we roll up our sleeves and get to work. I am delighted that we are having this debate. We hear a lot about job creators and business owners. Well, I am a small business owner, and I know what this crushing Federal debt does to small businesses all across our Nation and to job creators as well. It reduces certainty and stability, it scares away private sector investment that leads to growth for our economy, and it crushes the hopes of job creation.

Small businesses need to be able to forecast what their expenses will be in

the long term. Small businesses are reluctant to take risks when they don't know what their costs will be in the future. And if you listen to what the President said from his speech just yesterday, he made it clear that his vision of the future includes taking money out of the pockets of small businesses and job creators by increasing taxes on these very small businesses. This is the President's plan for addressing the deficit.

Increasing taxes on small businesses will have a devastating effect on job creation in this country. Two-thirds of all net new jobs in our Nation are created by small business, and 75 percent of those small businesses file their returns as an independent return on their individual tax forms. Rather than introduce the specter of uncertainty and increased taxes on our business community, we must instead make the choice to be relentless in our effort to support small businesses and actually encourage economic growth.

Last week PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, put forward a budget that cuts \$6.2 trillion over the decade, preventing the President's proposed tax increases from going into effect and putting the Nation on a fiscally sustainable path to give job creators and entrepreneurs all across the country the confidence to grow their business, to invest, and to create jobs.

□ 1210

Federal deficits, Madam Speaker, have ballooned over the last 3 years, and this budget blueprint for fiscal year 2012 starts to repair the damage and takes the serious steps to put ourselves on a path to paying off the debt and reducing our deficits.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, we need to work together to change America, to stop borrowing so much money and jeopardizing the future of our country. We agree on that.

But it's important that we understand that it's not the way to do that to end Medicare, and here is what ending Medicare means to the seniors and disabled people of this country. Today, if a person on Medicare has a medical problem, they choose their doctor. The doctor and the patient decide what should happen next and Medicare pays the lion's share of the bill. This is a system that works for America's seniors and works for America's disabled.

How do the Republicans want to change Medicare and end Medicare? This is what they want to do.

You won't choose your doctor, the insurance company will. If a doctor decides that a certain test or procedure is necessary, he or she will have to ask the insurance company's permission to get that test done. And the bill won't

be paid by Medicare. The bill will be paid by the insurance company when they feel like it, if they feel like it, for the amount that it should.

The Congressional Budget Office has looked at this issue at the request of Chairman RYAN and concluded that by the end of the implementation of this plan, seniors will pay an extra \$6,000 a year out of pocket for health care expenses: \$6,000 a year, \$500 a month, \$125 a week, beyond what they are paying right now for health care.

We will stand for Medicare. We will not stand for this budget. We will defeat it.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. This Republican budget does offer a path to prosperity. Unfortunately, it's China's prosperity.

For America, they offer a fast track to mediocrity, a descent into economic insecurity. It's the wrong path to global competitiveness. It's not that the level of our debt or the size of our tax rates is unimportant; it's that when you have such a narrow focus that you talk about little else, you forget America's other competitive strengths, our workforce, the need to invest to ensure the strongest and best-educated workforce anywhere in the world, and our infrastructure that allows American businesses to prosper across our country. It's also about preserving a broad middle class so that more Americans share in the bounty of this country instead of going to some third-world extreme where all the wealth is concentrated at those at the top of the ladder.

Today we have to choose. Instead of eliminating \$4 billion from early education and student financial assistance so that students can achieve all of their God-given potential, why not ask General Electric to at least pay the level of taxes that the mail clerks that work for it pay?

Instead of eliminating \$3 billion from our crumbling roads and bridges, why not ask those giant corporations that currently get a \$3 billion annual deduction when they borrow money to build a factory overseas without recognizing any of the income from that factory, to begin to pay their fair share. And instead of accepting this Republican nonsense that we have to have more tax breaks for the very wealthy in our country, why not use the same money to ensure a little dignity for our seniors in nursing homes across the country?

We need to stop exporting jobs and manufacturing and stop exporting our tax revenues overseas and begin developing a more competitive workforce right here in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. I will yield my time, but I will never yield to those Republicans who don't demand any sacrifice from Wall Street and all those big-bonus recipients but do demand that the rest of us pay for balancing their budget.

Oppose this Republican budget.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. I sit and listen to the conversation and the debate, and it is as if we are reading two entirely different documents. I feel like the Republicans are being portrayed as if they are going to have a horn grow out of their heads and immediately rush into homes and jerk out the poor and those that are on Social Security and the needy.

If you read the document, we are dealing with two central issues. The first of those issues is \$14 trillion in debt. Now, we can ignore that fact or we can begin to take it on and make serious decisions and have serious adult conversations.

The second issue that we take on is this one simple principle: Do we have a spending problem, or do we have a tax problem in America? In other words, do we need to tax a lot more, or do we need to spend less?

I think if you look at the rate of how we have been spending in America versus how we are taxing in America, you would say we have a spending issue. In our current time there are all these statements that are being made that Republicans want to protect the corporations, Republicans want to be able to give all these benefits to the wealthy.

Here's what we want to do with the tax rate: Leave it where it is now. That's not a 30 percent cut. That's not anything else. Where it is right now, that's the rate that we need to keep.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend from New York.

Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the seniors in my community.

Before we enacted Medicare in 1965, almost half of all seniors in our country had no health insurance coverage. That's why the creation of Medicare was so important, and now every one of America's seniors has access to quality health care coverage.

But today their care is at risk and under assault. The America we enjoy, as the result of the lifetimes of hard work by our seniors, and as they enter their well-deserved retirements, there are those who would callously rip away the commitment this Nation made to them.

The Republican budget for fiscal year 2012 is a Path to the Past and will return us to the dark days when seniors

agonized over access to health care. The Republican budget ends the guaranteed coverage of Medicare and replaces it with a grossly inadequate voucher system, subjugating seniors once again to the whims of private insurance companies and forcing them to bear the brunt of spiraling health care costs by themselves.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said seniors in 2030 would pay three times more for coverage under the Republican plan. The Republican budget reopens the doughnut hole in Medicare part D, forcing seniors once again to pay thousands of dollars of out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drug medication.

I was proud to fix that inequity and eliminate the doughnut hole last year. But the Path to the Past brings it back, roaring back, costing seniors thousands more.

But this Republican budget isn't just a cost-shifting trick to transfer the financial burden onto seniors, though it is that. The Republicans would also repeal the important reforms prohibiting insurers from denying coverage for pre-existing conditions.

That puts every single senior with preexisting conditions at risk. Even those who can afford the increased costs of privatized care, they could find themselves denied that care in the Republican plan. The Path to the Past needs to be rejected, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of our new Members, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I rise in opposition to this rule and against this budget. This Republican budget no longer honors our commitment to our seniors and doesn't reduce our deficit. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that the Republican plan will add \$8 trillion to the deficit over the next decade because the proposed cuts in spending are outpaced by gigantic tax cuts for the richest Americans.

□ 1220

You also can't say you care about seniors and then fight to enact policies that hurt seniors. Under their plan, they'll slash support for seniors in nursing homes while giving away tax breaks to companies that ship our jobs overseas.

And what else? American seniors will literally be paying more for their health care and getting less in order to finance additional tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans, also reflected in this Republican budget.

A budget is more than just about dollars and cents. It's a statement of our values and our priorities as a Nation. This Republican budget does not reflect the values of our great Nation. My friends on the other side of the aisle would rather cut benefits to sen-

iors than cut subsidies to big oil companies and big corporations that ship our jobs overseas.

They can quarrel with that argument, but these are the choices made in this budget. It ends Medicare as we know it. It slashes funding for nursing homes. It preserves tax cuts for the richest Americans and makes it even more generous. And it increases our debt. We have a responsibility to honor our commitment to our seniors. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if we can't protect our Greatest Generation and keep our promise to them, what is next?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for yielding.

We've got a good freshman class up there on the Rules Committee. And what we've been able to do under the leadership of Chairman DREIER is bring open processes to the floor. Can you imagine, we've got a multitude of budgets down here on the floor. If you want to look at the Congressional Black Caucus budget, you can vote for that today. If you want to vote for the Republican Study Committee budget, you can vote for that today. If you want to vote for Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, you can vote for that today. You have your choices today about what your priorities are and about what your vision for America's future is.

And when we have that conversation—and we've had it in the Budget Committee. I'm proud to be able to serve on both the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee—we've had that on the Budget Committee, an honest back and forth. So it pains me to come to the floor today and hear what can only be described as nonsense. Nonsense.

Have you heard anybody on the House floor today say that the Republican budget would change things for seniors? Have you heard that today? I believe you have because I've heard it over and over again. The truth of the matter is the Republican budget changes nothing, nothing for seniors. It says you don't even have to be a senior. If you're age 55 or older, we change nothing in Medicare for you. Nothing.

Yet my colleagues on the left are scaring today's seniors, scaring the folks who have the fewest number of choices in our society, scaring them into believing that folks are coming for them. Not true.

Our colleagues on the left would say \$6,000 is what we're going to charge additional to seniors. Well, two things: Number one, again, we're not doing anything for seniors. You've got to be 55 or younger. You've got to be my age to even begin to have a program change.

And more importantly, that \$6,000 figure comes from a CBO report looking at things 12 years down the road,

which is 2 years after the Medicare program has gone bankrupt entirely. Hear that. Hear that misinformation: \$6,000 per beneficiary, a number that comes from a report looking at the program 2 years after our trustees tell us it's going to go bankrupt entirely.

Folks, this is about choices. This is about your vision for America. You have to put forward your plan. I applaud Mr. VAN HOLLEN for putting a plan forward. He could have said, no, I don't have any ideas. That's what the White House has chosen to do. Mr. VAN HOLLEN did better. The Congressional Black Caucus did better. The Republican Study Committee did better.

Look at these budgets. Look at the open process. Make the choice for you about what you believe a better America would look like. The Wall Street Journal talked about the Path to Prosperity and called it the most serious attempt at reforming government in a generation. It absolutely is. I applaud Chairman RYAN for getting that done.

I thank my friend from South Carolina for the time, and I appreciate the Rules Committee giving us this open process that we have today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased, Madam Speaker, to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I want to thank my colleague from New York for allowing me to speak.

The gentleman before me was correct: we have lots of options today, and that's great. We have the Republican budget, we have a Democratic budget, we have a Black Caucus budget and we have a Progressive Caucus budget. We have lots of options.

I'm going to talk about the Republican budget.

The Republican proposal we're debating today is reckless and misguided. It slashes taxes for the wealthy and pays for them by gutting Medicare. Let me explain that. It cuts over \$30 billion in the first 10 years and will end Medicare by forcing seniors into private health insurance plans after 2022. They're right, if you're 54 years old now and you have high blood pressure and you're diabetic or prediabetic, you won't get Medicare. You'll get a voucher. And insurance companies don't want to cover those of us that may be diabetic or prediabetic or have high blood pressure. They're waiting to get on Medicare. They're not waiting to get a voucher.

It gradually excludes seniors and eventually raises the age to 67 for Medicare. The CBO says that in 2022, the Republican's proposal will more than double the cost paid by Medicare enrollees. We are throwing seniors out of Medicare and into the uncertainty of the private insurance market while providing tax breaks to the wealthy. And it doesn't make sense.

I also represent the Port of Houston, the 10th busiest port in the world. The

port is facing a dredging crisis. Ensuring dredging means ensuring jobs. But the Republican budget contains deep cuts in programs like the Army Corps of Engineers. Dredging cannot be funded privately. It has to come from the Corps and the Federal Government. Hundreds of thousands of jobs not only in our Port of Houston but also across the country under this plan will be put at risk.

There's one high point in the budget, and I commend Chairman RYAN for including language to put NASA on track with the authorization bill Congress passed last year and provide for an immediate transition for our next generation of human space flight program once the shuttle missions are concluded.

Despite that, I'm unable to support the plan that allows massive cuts for the wealthiest Americans and pays for them by ending Medicare while neglecting our ports.

This budget proposal makes over \$30 billion in cuts to Medicare over 10 years, seeks to eliminate Medicare, and shifts all seniors over to private insurance plans after 2022.

Beginning in 2022, Congressman RYAN's budget proposal would convert the current Medicare system to a system of premium support payments. Individuals, when they turn 65 and Disability Insurance beneficiaries who become eligible for Medicare in 2022 or later, would not enroll in the current Medicare program but would receive vouchers to purchase private insurance plans. In addition, the proposal would increase the age of eligibility for Medicare for 2 months per year until it reaches 67 in 2033.

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the Ryan budget proposal would more than double Medicare beneficiary costs in 2022, from \$5,538 to \$12,513, which is an increase of nearly \$7,000 per year in beneficiary premiums and co-insurance. Not one dollar of that increase in beneficiary costs goes to reducing the deficit—it all goes to cover the higher costs of private plans that the Republicans would force seniors to join. Additionally, the average 65-year-old in 2030 would have to pay about 68 percent of their health care costs (through premiums and co-payments), compared with 25 percent under current rules.

This is not the type of system we want for our seniors. Shifting individuals from a program like Medicare that works to private insurance plans that are only interested in making a profit is no way to reduce government spending and our deficit. In fact, the Ryan proposal once again shifts the burden of reducing the deficit onto the taxpayer and our seniors.

I represent the Port of Houston, the busiest port in the United States in terms of foreign tonnage, second-busiest in the United States in terms of overall tonnage, and tenth-busiest in the world. Unfortunately, the Port of Houston, like many Ports in this country, is facing a dredging crisis.

In my district, ensuring dredging means ensuring jobs. By maintaining our shipping channel we lower the cost of importing and exporting. We move more commerce through our city and into communities across the country. Workers at distribution centers, longshoremen, truck drivers, tug boat operators, and many other professions rely on a functional port.

The Port has identified over \$80 million in dredging needs and they were only receiving \$20 million of that in the President's budget request. The Republican Budget contains deep cuts, beyond the President's Budget, to programs like the Army Corps of Engineers. No other entity can fund these dredging projects but the Corps. Hundreds of thousands of jobs rely on the Port of Houston being one of the busiest in the world. Our oil and gas industry relies on a well-maintained, functioning port. It is critical to our economy and our Nation's strategic interests to maintain this port in the best condition possible, but under this plan, the budget will be cut.

We have heard a lot from the Republican side about freeing our private sector to create jobs, but now we see their budget, and we find out this just isn't the case.

While I am disappointed with nearly the Republicans' entire budget, I am pleased with one portion of it. I commend Chairman RYAN for including language that would put NASA on track to follow the Authorization bill Congress passed last year.

The plan in the authorization, and reaffirmed in this budget, would provide for an immediate transition to our next generation human space flight program.

If NASA follows its own plan, human space flight will be put into limbo once the Space Shuttle missions conclude.

By incorporating the compromise of the NASA authorization bill, we can use the valuable work accomplished during the Constellation program for the next generation of human space flight.

We can maximize cost-savings and offer the best value by leveraging tax payer dollars that have already been spent for the biggest benefit. These are goals that we must pursue during such difficult fiscal times.

If we do not effectively guide NASA backward a plan that is within the confines of the law, it will result in significant duplicative costs and unnecessary job losses.

Local economies, like my own in Houston, home of Johnson Space Center, will be hit hard when we have just begun to recover.

It is estimated by the Human Space Flight industry that at least 10,000 employees will be laid off under the more expensive, less effective, NASA budget proposal.

A failure to maintain preeminence in human space flight will have ripple effects that damage our education system, our technology industry's ability to innovate, and could handicap our global competitiveness for years to come.

We spend so much time talking about the importance of inspiring our students to pursue science, technology, engineering, and math disciplines. NASA serves as the single biggest catalyst for this inspiration.

Under the NASA budget proposal, there will be no new jobs for our STEM students. We must change the trajectory at NASA. The plan in the authorization bill costs less, does more, and will allow our Nation to maintain its role as the leader in space.

Despite this, I am unable to support any plan that allows massive tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and pays for them by ending Medicare while also neglecting maintaining our Ports, which are critical national interests.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Republicans say their budget is a "Path to Prosperity." But it's really a "Path to More Prosperity for the Already Prosperous." The Republican budget picks high-rolling oil executives over low-income families. It favors CEOs over senior citizens. It helps the wealthy over the working class.

How do Republicans pay for this gigantic goodie bag for the rich? Well, they eviscerate Medicare, turning it into an underfunded voucher program. Medicare becomes "Medicare-less." And to help seniors to pay for their medicines, GOP stands for "Grandma's Out of Prescriptions."

This budget is the same tired tune Republicans have been trotting out for decades. It's "Play It Again, Uncle Sam." In the 1980s, Ronald Reagan tried to slash the social safety net programs. In 2005, President Bush tried to privatize Social Security. And today, the same Republicans are trying to shred the social safety net they've opposed since it was created. It is not just déjà vu all over again. It's déjà voodoo economics all over again.

Vote down this misguided budget so that we can protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security now and into the future. Do not let Medicare become "Medicare-less." We don't want these people who always opposed Medicare, always opposed Social Security, opposed Medicaid as we put it on the books, to now come back and say, we're very courageous, we want to end those programs as we know it. But, by the way, where their courage has to be shown, they show none. They will not tax the rich. They only want to harm the poor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, the Republicans have shown with their budget proposal that they're intent on using the deficit as a pretense to end Medicare. Democrats proposed an amendment in the Budget Committee to protect Medicare, TRICARE for the military and VA health care from privatization or arbitrary spending caps. The Republicans all voted against it. Democrats tried again in the Rules Committee last night, but this rule does not allow the amendment to be brought to the House floor.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order Mr. TONKO's amendment to protect Medicare, TRICARE and veterans' health care from privatization or arbitrary spending caps.

□ 1230

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question so we can put every Member of the House on record as to where they stand on health care and if they want to end Medicare or not.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, finally, the Democrats do get it. What they get is, if they do not find a way to scare our senior citizens, they have no chance. When you cover the expenses of running this government and when you think about the fact that what the Democrats have proposed and what President Obama has proposed in his original budget is an increase of \$8.7 trillion of new spending and \$47 trillion of new spending in the next 10 years, the Democrats have finally found a way to cover their tracks, and it is on the backs of our senior citizens.

There is no doubt that the 2012 budget plan that we have proposed has no impact, not only on our senior citizens who are receiving benefits today, but on those over the age of 55.

Not only are the Democrats willing to scare our seniors based on nothing, but they want to go to 2 years after Medicare is bankrupt and then start having a conversation about numbers when Medicare would not exist under their plan.

What we do under our plan is a simple thing. We strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare for the next generation. We understand that it is time to roll up our sleeves and to get serious about preserving the American Dream for the next generation. Our budget does that by cutting \$6.2 trillion out of the deficit in the next 10 years and by creating more than 1 million jobs in the next 12 months—but we go further. We simply say that you do not create more disincentives or higher taxes in order to improve our economy.

Let us do exactly what the previous generation, the Greatest Generation, has done for us—pass on the American Dream in its entirety. We have a responsibility to the next generation in taking the tough road today in order to make the American Dream stronger tomorrow.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 223 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the adoption of an amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 3 as though printed as the last amendment in part B if offered by Representative Tonko of New York or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question

in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. — SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SAVING HEALTH CARE FOR SENIORS, MILITARY, AND VETERANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health security; and

(2) active duty military servicemembers and their families value the high-quality health care they receive through Tricare and other programs run by the Department of Defense, and veterans rely on the health service network run by the Department of Veterans Affairs to address their unique health needs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Congress should reject legislation that—

(A) protects tax cuts for the wealthy and special interests while shifting health care costs onto seniors through a policy to replace Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance; or

(B) damages the excellent care provided to the men and women who are serving and who have served the country in uniform; and

(2) any future health care legislation that eliminates quality Federal health care programs and—

(A) replaces them with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance; or

(B) sets caps on Federal health care spending,

should exclude programs for seniors, military servicemembers and their families, and veterans.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 223, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—238

Adams	Bass (NH)	Boustany
Aderholt	Benishak	Brady (TX)
Akin	Berg	Brooks
Alexander	Biggart	Brown (GA)
Amash	Bilbray	Buchanan
Austria	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Buerkle
Bachus	Black	Burgess
Barletta	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Bartlett	Bonner	Calvert
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Camp

Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Platts	Jackson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schakowsky	Culberson	Jones	Reed
Canseco	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)	Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Schiff	Davis (KY)	Jordan	Rehberg
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	(TX)	Moran	Schrader	Denham	Kelly	Renacci
Capito	Hultgren	Posey	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Dent	King (IA)	Ribble
Carter	Hunter	Price (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Nader	Scott (VA)	DesJarlais	King (NY)	Rigell
Chabot	Hurt	Quayle	Kaptur	Napolitano	Scott, David	Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Rivera
Chaffetz	Issa	Reed	Keating	Neal	Serrano	Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
Cleaver	Jenkins	Rehberg	Kildee	Owens	Sherman	Dreier	Kline	Roe (TN)
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Renacci	Kind	Pallone	Sires	Duffy	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (OH)	Ribble	Kissell	Pascrell	Slaughter	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)	Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (MI)
Conaway	Jones	Rivera	Langevin	Payne	Speier	Ellmers	Landry	Rohrabacher
Cravaack	Jordan	Roby	Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Stark	Emerson	Lankford	Rokita
Crawford	Kelly	Roe (TN)	Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Sutton	Farenthold	Latham	Rooney
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)	Fincher	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Levin	Peterson	Thompson (MS)	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Roskam
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Rogers (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Tierney	Flake	Lewis (CA)	Ross (FL)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher	Lipinski	Polis	Tonko	Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Royce
Dent	Kline	Rokita	Loeb	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Fleming	Long	Runyan
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rooney	Lofgren, Zoe	Quigley	Van Hollen	Flores	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Dold	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen	Lowey	Rahall	Velazquez	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Dreier	Lance	Roskam	Lujan	Rangel	Viscosky	Fortenberry	Lummis	Schilling
Duffy	Landry	Ross (FL)	Lynch	Reyes	Walz (MN)	Foxx	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Royce	Maloney	Richardson	Wasserman	Franks (AZ)	E.	Schock
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Runyan	Markey	Ross (AR)	Schultz	Frelinghuysen	Mack	Schweikert
Ellmers	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)	Matheson	Rothman (NJ)	Waters	Gallegly	Manzullo	Scott (SC)
Emerson	Latta	Scalise	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Watt	Gardner	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Farenthold	Lewis (CA)	Schilling	McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Waxman	Gerlach	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	LoBiondo	Schmidt	McCollum	Rush	Weiner	Gibbs	Matheson	Sessions
Fitzpatrick	Long	Schweikert	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Welch	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Flake	Lucas	Scott (SC)	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	McIntyre	T.	Woolsey	Gohmert	McClintock	Shuler
Fleming	Lummis	Sensenbrenner	McNeerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Wu	Goodlatte	McCotter	Shuster
Flores	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions	Michaud	Sarbanes	Yarmuth	Gosar	McHenry	Simpson
Forbes	E.	Shimkus				Gowdy	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	Mack	Shuler				Granger	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Foxx	Manzullo	Shuster	Cassidy	Moore	Schock	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Simpson	Diaz-Balart	Olver	Sewell	Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Southerland
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Smith (NE)	Giffords	Reichert	Towns	Griffin (AR)	Meehan	Stearns
Gallegly	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Meeks	Richmond		Griffith (VA)	Mica	Stivers
Gardner	McCaul	Smith (TX)				Grimm	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Garrett	McClintock	Southerland				Guinta	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Gerlach	McCotter	Stearns				Guthrie	Miller, Gary	Terry
Gibbs	McHenry	Stivers				Hall	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Gibson	McKeon	Stutzman				Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Gingrey (GA)	McKinley	Sullivan				Harper	Myrick	Tiberi
Gohmert	McMorris	Terry				Harris	Neugebauer	Tipton
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)				Hartzler	Noem	Turner
Gosar	Meehan	Thornberry				Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Upton
Gowdy	Mica	Tiberi				Hayworth	Nunes	Walberg
Granger	Miller (FL)	Tipton				Heck	Nunnelee	Walden
Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)	Turner				Heller	Olson	Walsh (IL)
Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary	Upton				Hensarling	Palazzo	Webster
Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney	Walberg				Herger	Paul	West
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)	Walden				Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Grimm	Myrick	Walsh (IL)				Huelskamp	Pearce	Whitfield
Guinta	Neugebauer	Webster				Huizenga (MI)	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Guthrie	Noem	West				Hultgren	Petri	Wittman
Hall	Nugent	Westmoreland				Hunter	Pitts	Wolf
Hanna	Nunes	Whitfield				Hurt	Platts	Womack
Harper	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)				Issa	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Harris	Olson	Wittman				Jenkins	Pompeo	Yoder
Hartzler	Palazzo	Wolf				Johnson (IL)	Posey	Young (AK)
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Womack				Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Young (FL)
Hayworth	Paulsen	Woodall				Johnson, Sam	Quayle	Young (IN)
Heck	Pearce	Yoder						
Heller	Pence	Young (AK)						
Hensarling	Petri	Young (FL)						
Herger	Pitts	Young (IN)						

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1256

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 265, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 265, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—243

Ackerman	Cicilline	Ellison	Adams	Bishop (UT)	Canseco
Altmire	Clarke (MI)	Engel	Aderholt	Black	Cantor
Andrews	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Akin	Blackburn	Capito
Baca	Clay	Farr	Alexander	Bonner	Carney
Baldwin	Clyburn	Fattah	Amash	Bono Mack	Carter
Barrow	Cohen	Filner	Austria	Boustany	Cassidy
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)	Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Becerra	Conyers	Fudge	Bachus	Brooks	Chaffetz
Berkley	Cooper	Garamendi	Barletta	Brown (GA)	Coble
Berman	Costa	Gonzalez	Bartlett	Buchanan	Coffman (CO)
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Green, Al	Barton (TX)	Bucshon	Cole
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Green, Gene	Bass (NH)	Buerkle	Conaway
Blumenauer	Critz	Grijalva	Benishek	Burgess	Cooper
Boren	Crowley	Gutiérrez	Berg	Burton (IN)	Costa
Boswell	Cuellar	Hanabusa	Biggert	Calvert	Cravaack
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Hastings (FL)	Bilbray	Camp	Crawford
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Heinrich	Bilirakis	Campbell	Crenshaw
Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)	Higgins			
Butterfield	DeFazio	Himes			
Capps	DeGette	Hinchee			
Capuano	DeLauro	Hirono			
Cardoza	Deuth	Holden			
Carnahan	Dicks	Holt			
Carney	Dingell	Honda			
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hoyer			
Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)	Inslee			
Chandler	Doyle	Israel			
Chu	Edwards				

NAYS—183

NAYS—181

Ackerman	Clyburn	Green, Gene
Altmire	Connolly (VA)	Grijalva
Andrews	Conyers	Gutiérrez
Baca	Costello	Hanabusa
Baldwin	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Barrow	Critz	Heinrich
Bass (CA)	Crowley	Higgins
Becerra	Cuellar	Himes
Berkley	Cummings	Hinchee
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Holden
Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Holt
Boren	Boren	Honda
Boswell	Boswell	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Brady (PA)	Insee
Braley (IA)	Braley (IA)	Israel
Brown (FL)	Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Butterfield	Jackson Lee
Capps	Capps	(TX)
Capuano	Capuano	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.
Carnahan	Carnahan	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Carson (IN)	Keating
Castor (FL)	Castor (FL)	Farr
Chandler	Chandler	Kildee
Chu	Chu	Kind
Cicilline	Cicilline	Kissell
Clarke (MI)	Clarke (MI)	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Langevin
Clay	Clay	Garamendi
Cleaver	Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Lee (CA)

Levin	Payne	Serrano	Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Gerlach	Latta	Rooney
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Sewell	Clarke (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Quayle	Gibson	Lee (CA)	Rothman (NJ)
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Sherman	Clay	Jones	Quigley	Graves (MO)	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Loeback	Peters	Sires	Cleaver	Jordan	Rangel	Green, Gene	LoBiondo	Sánchez, Linda
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson	Slaughter	Coffman (CO)	Kaptur	Rehberg	Griffith (VA)	Maloney	T.
Lowey	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)	Cohen	Kelly	Reyes	Grimm	Marchant	Sarbanes
Luján	Polis	Speier	Cole	Kildee	Ribble	Gutierrez	Markey	Schakowsky
Lynch	Price (NC)	Stark	Conaway	Kind	Richardson	Hanna	McCotter	Schock
Maloney	Quigley	Sutton	Connolly (VA)	King (IA)	Rigell	Harris	McDermott	Schwartz
Markey	Rahall	Thompson (CA)	Cooper	King (NY)	Rivera	Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Serrano
Matsui	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Costa	Kingston	Roby	Heck	McKinley	Sires
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Tierney	Costello	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)	Heller	Meehan	Slaughter
McCollum	Richardson	Tonko	Courtney	Kissell	Rogers (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Stivers
McDermott	Richmond	Tsongas	Crawford	Klaine	Rogers (KY)	Hinche	Moore	Terry
McGovern	Ross (AR)	Van Hollen	Labrador	Labrador	Rogers (MI)	Honda	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
McIntyre	Rothman (NJ)	Velázquez	Lamborn	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Hoyer	Nugent	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Ruppertsberger	Lance	Lance	Rokita	Inslee	Pallone	Tiberi
Michaud	Rush	Walz (MN)	Culberson	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen	Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Tipton
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman	Walz (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Roskam	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Velázquez
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz	Davis (KY)	Larson (CT)	Ross (AR)	Jackson Lee	Peters	Visclosky
Moore	T.	Watt	DeGette	Latham	Ross (FL)	(TX)	Peterson	Walberg
Moran	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman	DeLauro	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Walden
Murphy (CT)	Sarbanes	Weiner	Denham	Levin	Royce	Keating	Rahall	Waters
Nadler	Schakowsky	Welch	DesJarlais	Lewis (CA)	Runyan	Kucinich	Reed	Weiner
Napolitano	Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Deutch	Lipinski	Ruppertsberger	Landry	Renacci	Wu
Neal	Schrader	Woolsey	Diaz-Balart	Loeback	Rush	Langevin	Richmond	Young (AK)
Owens	Schwartz	Wu	Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (WI)			
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth	Dingell	Long	Sanchez, Loretta			
Pascrell	Scott, David		Doggett	Lowe	Scalise			
Pastor (AZ)			Doyle	Lucas	Schiff	Amash	Gohmert	
			Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Schilling			
			Duncan (SC)	Luján	Schmidt			
			Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Schrader			
			Edwards	Lungren, Daniel	Schweikert			
			Ellmers	E.	Scott (SC)			
			Emerson	Lynch	Scott, Austin			
			Engel	Mack	Scott, David			
			Eshoo	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner			
			Farenthold	Marino	Sessions			
			Farr	Matheson	Sewell			
			Fattah	Matsui	Sherman			
			Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus			
			Fleischmann	McCarthy (NY)	Shuler			
			Fleming	McCaul	Shuster			
			Flores	McClintock	Simpson			
			Fortenberry	McCollum	Smith (NE)			
			Frank (MA)	McHenry	Smith (NJ)			
			Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Smith (TX)			
			Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (WA)			
			Galleghy	McMorris	Southerland			
			Garamendi	Rodgers	Speier			
			Garrett	McNerney	Stark			
			Gibbs	Mica	Stearns			
			Gingrey (GA)	Michaud	Stutzman			
			Gonzalez	Miller (FL)	Sullivan			
			Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Sutton			
			Gosar	Miller (NC)	Thompson (PA)			
			Gowdy	Miller, Gary	Thornberry			
			Granger	Moran	Tierney			
			Graves (GA)	Mulvaney	Tonko			
			Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Tsongas			
			Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)	Turner			
			Guinta	Myrick	Upton			
			Guthrie	Nadler	Van Hollen			
			Hall	Neal	Walsh (IL)			
			Hanabusa	Neugebauer	Walz (MN)			
			Harper	Noem	Wasserman			
			Hartzler	Nunes	Schultz			
			Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee	Watt			
			Hayworth	Olson	Waxman			
			Heinrich	Owens	Webster			
			Hensarling	Palazzo	Welch			
			Hergert	Pascrell	West			
			Higgins	Paul	Westmoreland			
			Himes	Paulsen	Whitfield			
			Hinojosa	Payne	Wilson (FL)			
			Hirono	Pearce	Wilson (SC)			
			Holden	Pence	Wittman			
			Holt	Perlmutter	Wolf			
			Huelskamp	Petri	Womack			
			Huizenga (MI)	Pingree (ME)	Woodall			
			Hultgren	Pitts	Woolsey			
			Hunter	Platts	Yarmuth			
			Issa	Polis	Yoder			
			Jenkins	Pompeo	Young (FL)			
			Johnson (GA)	Posey	Young (IN)			
			Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)				

NOT VOTING—8

Cohen	Meeks	Towns
Garrett	Olver	Waters
Giffords	Reichert	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1305

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 106, answered "present" 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—311

Ackerman	Berman	Bucshon
Adams	Biggart	Buerkle
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burton (IN)
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Austria	Black	Camp
Baca	Blackburn	Campbell
Bachmann	Blumenauer	Canseco
Bachus	Bonner	Cantor
Barletta	Bono Mack	Cardoza
Barrow	Boren	Carnahan
Bartlett	Boustany	Carney
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bass (NH)	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Becerra	Brooks	Chabot
Benishek	Broun (GA)	Chaffetz
Berg	Brown (FL)	Chandler
Berkley	Buchanan	Cicilline

NAYS—106

Altmire	Chu	Donnelly (IN)
Andrews	Clyburn	Duffy
Baldwin	Conyers	Ellison
Bass (CA)	Cravaack	Filner
Bibray	Cuellar	Fincher
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Fitzpatrick
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Forbes
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Foxx
Capuano	Dent	Fudge
Carson (IN)	Dold	Gardner

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Amash	Gohmert
-------	---------

NOT VOTING—13

Burgess	Giffords	Reichert
Capito	Grijalva	Scott (VA)
Capps	Hurt	Towns
Castor (FL)	Meeks	
Coble	Olver	

□ 1313

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, April 15, 2011, or Saturday, April 16, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2011, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, April 14, 2011, through Friday, April 29, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, May 2, 2011, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.